1-1-1994

The school as a workplace : the perspectives of secondary school physical educators.

Kathy M. Pinkham
University of Massachusetts Amherst

THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE: THE PERSPECTIVES OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PHYSICAL EDUCATORS

A Dissertation Presented

by

KATHY M. PINKHAM

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

February 1994
School of Education

THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE: THE PERSPECTIVES OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PHYSICAL EDUCATORS

A Dissertation Presented

by

KATHY M. PINKHAM

Approved as to style and content by:

Patt Dodds, Chair

Lawrence F. Locke, Member

Judith H. Placek, Member

Patricia A. Greenfield, Member

Bailey W. Jackson, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

No friend or relationship can ever cross our path without changing our life in some way. This dissertation is dedicated to those who have taught me to be myself in a world that has tried its best to make me be like everybody else.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to the many individuals who have supported me throughout the process of working on this dissertation. Among them are:

my committee chair -- Patt Dodds

my committee -- Larry Locke, Judy Placek, and Pat Greenfield

the entire PETE family

my parents and family

my family of friends who provided both needed support and distractions throughout a long process

my pets -- whose devoted companionship has seen me through many late nights

ABSTRACT

THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE: THE PERSPECTIVES

OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PHYSICAL EDUCATORS

FEBRUARY, 1994

KATHY M. PINKHAM, B.S., SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE

M.S., ITHACA COLLEGE

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Patt Dodds

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of how 16 secondary school physical educators working in three different schools described and made sense of the place in which they worked. Three broad views of the school as a workplace were identified in the literature: (a) the physical setting of the school, (b) how the school is organized, and (c) the culture in which teachers do their work.

Teachers were asked to take pictures of their school as a workplace and then to described their pictures. A minimum of three weeks was spent at each school. Field notes were taken during job shadowing and observations and transcripts of informal and formal interviews were generated.

School profiles were developed to describe the physical, organizational, and cultural characteristics of

each school. Although the profiles represent the job of teaching physical education in secondary schools, they represent three distinctly different work environments in which the job of teaching occurs. There were also broad similarities identified among the three schools. These similarities are represented in the form of the following themes: (a) teachers feel ambivalent about the effects of isolation, (b) teachers lack control over significant aspects of their daily work lives, (c) teachers seek rewards for activities other than physical education instruction, (d) teachers feel a vacuum in department leadership: like a boat without a rudder, (e) teachers are influenced more by students than by any other aspect of their workplace, (f) teachers' finite time and energy are drawn away from instruction toward other responsibilities.

This study found that school context has a significant impact on teachers, their work and their behavior in the workplace and that schools have a strong role in defining the job of teaching physical education. Although the construct of teaching implies work that is common and well-known, work in schools varies in relation to the specific context of each school. Cultural variation among these schools defined their most important differences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Teaching, learning and schooling are context bound or situation specific (Griffin, 1990). Schools differ from one another in a variety of ways (e.g., small, large, rural, urban, wealthy, impoverished, old, new) yet few teachers receive the special training needed to understand the specific school in which they will teach. For teachers, each school presents a unique work environment made up of a variety of individual workplace factors. Within the particular context of a school, workplace factors can have both negative and positive impacts on teachers' abilities to perform their jobs. In order to understand teachers and teaching, we need to understand them within the total context of individual schools. It may not be enough to study teaching in physical education without careful examination of the influences of school context on that teaching.

It is becoming more and more prevalent for researchers to study teachers and teaching within the context of the school as a workplace (Bruckerhoff, 1991; Lieberman, 1988; Little & McLaughlin, 1993a; McLaughlin, Talbert & Bascia, 1990; Reyes, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989; Smyth, 1993). By understanding the school work environment from the perspective of teachers, researchers can better understand

how (if at all) school context influences teachers' beliefs about teaching physical education and their actual teaching behaviors.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of how secondary school physical educators perceive their schools as a workplace. The specific research questions that guided this research were

1. How do secondary school physical education teachers describe their work environment and what do they describe as being significant when asked to talk about their workplace?
2. How do secondary school physical education teachers perceive the impact, if any, of the school context on their teaching?

Through teachers' photographs, formal and informal interviewing, and non-participant observation, I explored the school as a workplace from the perspective of secondary school physical educators. More specifically, this study investigated how secondary school physical education teachers in three different schools described and made sense of these places in which they worked.

In the following sections, the rationale and plan for this study will be outlined. The study itself consists of

the following chapters: (a) introduction, (b) review of literature, (c) methodology, (d) results and (e) discussion.

Significance of the Study

This investigation is significant for the following reasons. First, findings from this research will describe the school workplace from the perspective of secondary school physical education teachers who work in schools. If we are truly to understand teaching physical education in secondary schools, we must understand it from the perspective of those people who do it daily. While schools can be described, and workplace factors can be identified by both researchers and teachers alike, only teachers can provide the meaning that school context and specific workplace factors give to their work.

Second, findings from this research will help us to understand how some secondary school physical education teachers view their work. It is reasonable to assume that how teachers view their workplace may have an impact on how teachers view their work. The conditions of the workplace have the potential either to facilitate or restrict teachers' abilities to perform or to be satisfied with their teaching roles (Templin, 1989). If schools recruit talented people but fail to provide a work environment in

which they can become successful, teachers will become disillusioned with their careers, no matter how well qualified they are (Conley, Bacharach, & Bauer, 1989). In addition, individual teachers may perceive the same workplace conditions very differently. Therefore, it is important to identify ways to investigate schools as workplaces that will allow researchers to understand not only what constitutes the school as a workplace, but also the relationship of the work environment to individual teachers' work.

Finally, learning more about the relationship between teaching physical education and the context of the school as a workplace will give us some clues about possible ways to change schools to make them better places to teach. In addition, we may learn things that can help us to better prepare physical education teachers during their preservice training and assist them during the transition to the schools where they will teach.

Dreeben (1970, 1973) coined the phrase "school as a workplace". He suggested that conceiving of schools as workplaces allows us to borrow concepts and perspectives from other disciplines that study the world of work and apply them to schools, thus making schools easier to understand. Dreeben cautioned, however, that schools differ in their social and ecological arrangements. As a

result, teachers who seemingly are performing similar jobs in different school settings very often have very different jobs.

Dreeben's phrase also was intended to underscore the nature of schools as social institutions, for which community context is part of the influence which governs daily life. For him, the workplace included relationships between schools and their external environments (e.g., political, economic, and social) as well as their internal structure (e.g., characteristic relationships of authority, shared language and technology).

Presently, researchers differ in their understandings of what constitutes the school workplace. Those researchers who have studied teachers' perceptions of the school as a workplace report that teachers provide dissimilar lists of workplace factors. Dombart (1987), Kershaw (1987), and Veal, Clift and Holland (1989) all studied teachers' perceptions of their work environment, yet they all presented a different package of factors pertinent to describing the school as a workplace. These scholars varied considerably in the terms they used to refer to various aspects of schools as a work environment. Although this is expected given the differences among teacher respondents, research methods used, and forms of

data analysis employed, the lack of standardized terminology makes it difficult both to read and synthesize research on the school as a workplace.

Dombart (1987) directly addressed this terminology problem by pulling together various terms used by authors to describe the work setting in schools. Terms such as setting, system, systemic properties of the organization, environment, ecology, context, program organization, institution, climate, and culture were all used in reference to schools as places where teachers work. Dombart (1987) observed that although different terms were used to refer to the school workplace, the definitions shared two major points. "The authors intended more than a description of a physical plant and they intended to emphasize the importance of a work setting for the individual [teacher] working in it and, thus, its impact on behavior" (p. 14).

The secondary teachers in Dombart's (1987) study mentioned the building, the community, the school board, administrators, other teachers, and students when describing the setting in which they worked. They described the school setting as being both rewarding and frustrating and believed that what they did in the classroom was the crucial function of the school setting.

Nevertheless, they perceived their schools as operating as though teachers were incidental, rather than central. Dombart's (1987) teachers believed that they had to challenge and motivate themselves because their settings did neither.

Kershaw (1987) used questionnaires and interviews to identify workplace factors of importance to the career satisfaction of effective teachers in elementary, middle, and high schools. In Kershaw's study, workplace factors included working conditions, resources, workload, support systems, formal rewards system, work control, inclusion, job enrichment, sense of achievement, recognition, growth, and status. She found that the majority of teachers indicated that all of these workplace factors were important to the quality of their worklives. Sense of achievement, growth, and formal reward systems were consistently identified as the most important workplace factors by these teachers.

Veal et al. (1989) asked both elementary and secondary teachers to discuss their feelings about their school as a workplace as part of a study about the relationships between school context and learning how to teach. In this study, responses referring to the school workplace were grouped into four categories: (a) interpersonal

(interactions with administrators, colleagues, and students); (b) instructional (curriculum, teacher autonomy, student learning, time available to teach, flexibility of the teaching schedule, and teacher/student ratio); (c) schoolwide discipline; and (d) other noninstructional matters such as paperwork, meetings, physical plant, and relationships of parents to the learning process.

The problem of conflicting language and terminology is not the only one confronted by the reader of workplace literature. A second difficulty is that researchers tend to discuss findings from studies of teaching and teachers as though they were "workplace free", without reference to the specific characteristics of the particular school in which the teachers were studied. Too often, researchers have analyzed teachers' work and reported findings with little reference made to the influences that the school workplace has on those findings. Such context-stripping inevitably leaves research consumers wondering whether similar findings would hold true in their own schools or classrooms. More to the point, the reader is left without information that may be essential to understanding any observation or conclusion.

Although it is important to understand how scholars have used the phrase "school as a workplace", there is no

consensus about how teachers view their work environment or which workplace factors teachers define as being important. Teachers obviously are affected both personally and professionally by their work, and the workplace may play a key role. The workplace certainly can influence such things as the number of hours teachers spend at school, the amount of time available to work with colleagues, the equipment and materials available for instruction, as well as the perceived latitude of instructional freedom. The work environment also includes such everyday school conditions as class interruptions, noise levels, temperature, ventilation, space, and traffic flow. All of these have the potential to make a difference in the ability of teachers to work effectively in their schools.

Workplace Conditions for Physical Education Teachers

Only a few researchers have studied workplace conditions for physical education teachers (Griffin, 1985; Lawson, 1989; Smyth, 1993; Templin, 1989). Nevertheless, their work shares a common conclusion. Their work has implied a strong relationship between the school context and teaching physical education. In other words, as Dreeben (1970; 1973) suggested more generally, teaching

physical education classes in different schools may be very different work due to factors comprising the workplace.

Griffin (1985) cautions us that it is important to consider contextual factors when assessing the quality of instruction inside the gym. The school context in which physical education programs exist has a tremendous influence on both the types and the quality of programs offered. Physical education programs are different in part because schools are different. Such things as amount and condition of equipment, student/teacher ratio, available facilities, and administrative support are all examples of contextual factors that influence the quality of physical education programs in the public schools.

By understanding these and other contextual influences, we can begin to differentiate problems within physical education programs from problems within a specific school context. For too long, physical educators have taken full responsibility for poor physical education programs in our schools when the context for teaching has presented "large class sizes, inadequate resources, and hiring practices which select teachers not on the basis of their ability to teach but upon their potential as a coach" (Bain, 1983, p. 41). In order to have quality physical education programs, schools will have to accept their share

of responsibility by providing a supportive context in which quality programs can exist.

Many times, secondary physical education teachers are able to provide quality programs in spite of less than adequate conditions (Locke, Griffin, & Templin, 1986; Templin, 1983). Templin (1983) edited a series in which fourteen outstanding secondary school physical educators were profiled as excellent teachers. Locke et al. (1986) edited a series of seven profiles in which physical education teachers were presented as struggling to overcome obstacles in their workplace. Here, the authors recognized the impact that the individual schools had on quality physical education programs.

> What we are most likely to know about working teachers is that they often are talented, dedicated, and energetic, but because of obstacles encountered in the workplace, they never reach the excellence for which they strive, or they achieve it only on rare occasions of special triumph (Locke et al. 1986, p. 32).

Contextual factors not only affect programs but also affect teachers, both personally and professionally. Templin (1989) warns us that these contextual influences may be more powerful than one's professional training or past experience.

Learning what these contextual factors are becomes a big part of a teacher's job. This is especially true for first year teachers or even experienced teachers who transfer to a new workplace. Much of new teachers' time is spent trying to figure the workplace out and trying to understand their job in relation to the expectations of their workplace. Lawson (1989) talks about induction into physical education as occurring in two stages, the first being the professional preparation program and the second being induction into a new school. It is this second stage that is of interest here.

Lawson (1989) calls this second stage "organizational socialization" (p.149), referring to how new teachers interact and learn once in the workplace. He uses another term, "organizational culture" (Lawson, 1989, p.151), to indicate what new teachers learn. Lawson names political and economic factors, organizational factors, situational factors and personal-social factors as influencing workplace conditions for physical education teachers.

For many new physical educators, this induction period is a trying experience and dealing directly with workplace factors is a big part of gaining membership and acceptance into the local occupational community. Teachers must learn what it is that they have to do in order to cross the line

from outsider to insider within the context of their new workplace. They work hard figuring out how to cross what Lawson (1989) calls "functional boundaries" and "inclusionary boundaries" (p.151).

Crossing functional boundaries certifies that new teachers can teach in ways that are expected and accepted within the school community. For example, if innovative programs are the norm throughout the school, teachers will expect a new physical educator to provide an innovative physical education program. Crossing inclusionary boundaries means that a new teacher has been accepted as "one of the gang" and can now experience friendships and professional relationships with other teachers in the school. Some teachers cross these boundaries with relative ease while some may never cross them, but whatever the outcome, site-specific expectations inherent in each work environment strongly influence the work lives of new physical education teachers during induction (Smyth, 1993).

The previous discussion signals a need to understand a teacher's workplace before one can expect to understand a teacher's behavior in that workplace. Put another way, in order to understand teaching we need to understand the context in which teaching takes place. By focusing our attention on schools as workplaces we can better understand

how teachers perceive their work environment. To do so effectively, we need to solicit the opinions of teachers and gather information about teachers' perceptions of the school work environment. Teachers spend a large portion of their waking hours living and working in schools. Many spend their entire teaching career in one single school building. This is a significant amount of time spent in one workplace.

A Need for Boundaries when Looking at the School as a Workplace

Literature defining the school as a workplace was sparse and the portion pertaining to physical educators was almost non-existent. As a result, literature on other topics was used to conceptualize a framework for understanding the school work environment of teachers. Descriptive accounts of schools, literature on the topics of culture, organizational culture and ultimately school culture, and literature describing organizations and schools as organizations were the primary resources for this framework. A pilot study in which elementary school teachers were interviewed about their perceptions of their school work environment (Pinkham, 1990) was the second source from which a conceptual framework for understanding the school as a workplace was constructed.

When thinking about schools, it became important to draw boundaries in order to keep the framework both manageable and applicable. Inside each school thousands of actions and interactions occur on a regular basis. All these activities could be considered workplace factors which could affect teachers and their teaching. Even so, it is not helpful to suggest a definition of the workplace that is extremely broad and inclusive.

Examples from the literature point out that references made to the school work environment have been varied and differ in their definition. It is important to narrow this focus to a set of concepts that will capture the essence of the workplace that individual teachers experience inside schools -- those factors that are unique to each individual school. By doing so, one may be better able to understand some of the complicated relationships between teachers' workplaces and teachers' work.

What will not be Included in this Framework

While it is important to establish a common language for understanding the school as a workplace, it is equally important to set clear boundaries for what will and will not be included in the discussion. When considering the environment of teaching, it must be understood that much of

what goes on in schools is related to forces from outside. A school's surrounding environment makes up a system of which that school is a part, and influences from that environment permeate the school boundaries. We can designate everything outside the school as being a part of that school's environment (Birnbaum, 1988; Hall, 1977) and these outside factors play a major role in what goes on within the school's boundaries.

For example, schools have an intimate relationship with the community in which they exist. This particular contextual element determines such things as the student population, local tax support, and program emphasis. Sweeny (1983) refers to these external forces as ecological influences and cites as examples resource allocations, values for education within the larger society, social control attitudes (e.g., communities' attitudes about the school's responsibility in terms of social issues, civil rights, students' rights), educational ideologies, and political moods and movements. All of these will affect the internal day-to-day functions within a school.

There is a continuous and everchanging influence on schools from the outside and to assume that these outside forces do not exert a major influence on the work that teachers do inside schools and classrooms would be an

error. Although outside environmental forces do exist, it is beyond the scope of this paper to identify all the external forces that affect schools and the work of teachers. On the other hand, it is impossible to keep the influence of these outside forces from creeping into discussions about things that occur inside schools. The purpose here is to focus on the work environment inside the school. While influences from outside forces may occasionally be inferred, it is my intent to try to work within these internal boundaries.

What will be Included in this Framework

The literature provides little understanding about what actually constitutes the complexity of the school workplace as it relates to the work that teachers do. Much of the literature identified with the key phrase "school workplace" consists of articles that focus on schools as places where teachers work, but does not provide clear definitions for understanding the term "school workplace". What one can find from this blend of literature is a variety of definitional frameworks for studying schools.

Some authors provide rich descriptions of schools (Cusick, 1973; Goodlad, 1984; Peshkin, 1986; Smith & Keith, 1971). Some authors study schools from a cultural

perspective (Lieberman, 1988; Rossman, Corbett, & Firestone, 1988; Sarason, 1982) while others study schools as organizations (Corwin & Edelfelt 1977; Gray, ND; Rosenholtz, 1989). Although all of these perspectives have implications for understanding schools and the work teachers do in schools, no single perspective accurately represents the multifaceted nature of the school workplace as experienced by teachers.

None of this is to say, however, that school workplace factors cannot be identified by inference from studies that investigate teachers, schools, and the work teachers do. Investigators have been able to identify factors in the workplace that have an effect on teacher stress (Schwartz, Olsen, Bennett, & Ginsberg, 1983), on teachers' attitudes (Sergiovanni, 1969), and on teachers' job satisfaction (Allison, 1986; Rog & Pinkham, 1987). Other workplace factors for teachers have been related to school improvement (Duffy & Roehler, 1986; Fullan, 1985; Guskey, 1986; Lieberman & Rosenholtz, 1987; Lightfoot, 1986), to effective schools (Cohen, 1973; Little, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1983), and to effective staff and teacher development (Little, 1982; Pinkham, Hickey, Boscardin & Dodds, 1989; Rossman, Corbett, & Firestone, 1988).

While individual workplace factors can be inferred from studies such as those mentioned above, it is important

to remember that they are no more than contextual elements that are peripheral to the primary research interest of individual researchers. This literature provides no example of a direct systematic attempt to explore workplace factors per se. Completed studies provide neither a sufficient basis for organizing workplace factors into a conceptual framework nor for establishing the nature of the relationships between any given factor and particular consequences for teachers' lives and teachers' work.

While isolated workplace factors can affect specific aspects of teaching and while partial understanding of the school workplace can be achieved from within each of several perspectives, I propose that the combination of the physical place, how that place is organized to facilitate the work of teaching, and the culture within each individual school, taken together, provide a useful way to understand the school as a workplace. Each of these three vantage points will be examined in more detail in the literature review (Chapter Two).

An important point for readers to remember is that all teachers, regardless of their subject matter specialty or grade level, are equally affected by school context -- but not necessarily in the same way. Because of this assumption, and because little literature addresses

workplace conditions for physical educators, the following literature review will present studies from general education to provide some understanding of the school workplace for all teachers. In some ways, physical education teachers will experience their workplace in much the same way as other teachers. In other ways, physical education teachers will experience the workplace very differently.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature in this chapter explores the school workplace in terms of its relationship to teachers' work. To understand this relationship, three broad views of the school as a workplace have been identified and presented as a structure for this review of literature: (a) the physical setting of the school, (b) the organizational aspects of the school, and (c) the culture in which teachers do their work. These components have been identified as separate but intertwined parts that comprise the school workplace for teachers.

Each domain will be presented separately to illustrate that the school workplace can be viewed in isolated parts that singly, and in combination, affect teachers' work in schools. The general education literature will show the relationship between each domain and teachers' work in schools. Although physical education teachers are included in this group, the physical education literature will identify specific relationships between the workplace and secondary school physical educators.

Although presented separately, it is the combination of these three domains that create "the school as a workplace" for teachers. Teachers experience schools, not as single parts, but as a combination of parts. Teachers

teach in schools where all three domains come together to create a school work environment.

The Physical Characteristics of the School as a Workplace

Many researchers have identified physical characteristics of schools (Cusick, 1973; Everhart, 1983; McLaren, 1986; Smith & Geoffrey, 1968) as part of rich descriptions of life in schools. Perhaps this is because the physical characteristics of schools are the most easily observable to the outsider. Less observable, but still of interest to many researchers, is how the internal physical arrangement of schools affects students and teachers.

The basic design of teachers' most immediate work environment (the classroom) has changed very little since its evolution from the one room schoolhouse to the multiroom school. Dreeben (1970) discussed the internal spatial arrangements of schools and their implications for the work and career development of teachers. He suggested that the most obvious characteristic of schools is their division into isolated classrooms, each containing an aggregate of pupils under the direction of one teacher. This physical separation encourages teachers to work in isolation and limits their opportunities to observe each other's work or to learn firsthand from their colleagues. Lortie (1975), suggesting that schools have traditionally

been organized around teacher separation rather than teacher interdependence, portrayed the modern school as developing from a series of "cells" which were structured to be "self-sufficient". This concept has come to be known as the "egg crate" school (Lortie, 1975).

Open-space schools constituted the first major architectural departure from the traditional egg-crate school buildings (Weinstein, 1979). The deliberate physical design of open-space schools presents unique workplace factors for teachers that are not necessarily present in traditional schools. Open-space schools were designed without interior walls with the intent to permit flexibility in scheduling and spatial arrangements, encourage interaction among students and teachers, facilitate team teaching, and allow for learning options that the self-contained classroom was less able to support (Weinstein, 1979).

Researchers who have focused on the physical characteristics of schools primarily have addressed the influences of the physical environment on students and on students' work rather than on teachers and teachers' work. A review of research on the impact of classroom environment on student behavior, attitudes, and achievement, however, has some implications for teachers. Weinstein (1979) reported that working in an alternative environment,

specifically open-space schools, led to increased interaction among teachers; provided greater feelings of autonomy, satisfaction, and ambition; placed value on evaluation by colleagues; and required less time to be spent on routine activities. Conversely, in Smith and Keith's (1971) study of the failure of one open-space school, the negative effects of building design on organizational structure, teachers' attitudes, and privacy were factors in the failure of the innovation to survive the early stage of implementation. Even though these two studies note contradictory effects of the physical characteristics of the workplace, one point is clear: findings such as these suggest that there is a relationship between the physical environment and teachers' work.

With the exception of the open-space school, the physical design of schools has changed very little over the years. The popular "egg-crate" design of schools continues to influence teachers to work alone in their own individual classrooms and makes it difficult for them to congregate or to physically observe one another's teaching. Such things as size, shape, design, and physical condition of classrooms influence how teachers can and cannot use their classrooms in terms of spatial arrangements. The physical location of the classroom in relation to the rest of the

school may dictate such things as whom the teacher sees and talks with regularly, what noises and distractions the teacher must address, and who, if anyone, is aware of what that teacher is doing.

Physical Characteristics of Schools in Relation to Physical Education

Among those researchers who do address the workplace for physical education teachers there is some discussion about the physical characteristics of schools (Griffin, 1985: Locke, Griffin & Templin, 1986; Smyth, 1993; Templin, 1983). Griffin (1985), like Dreeben, has implied that there is a relationship between the workplace and teachers' work. Others have indicated that workplace conditions (e.g., gymnasia that double as cafeterias, quality of indoor facilities, and location and availability of outdoor facilities) play a major role in the work lives of teachers (Griffin, 1985; Locke, Griffin & Templin, 1986; Smyth, 1993; Templin, 1983).

The gymnasium as an "isolated cell". The literature from general education indicates that the internal spatial arrangements of schools influences the work and career development of teachers (Dreeben, 1970; Lortie, 1975; Weinstein, 1979). It has been argued that being physically isolated into separate classrooms creates a workplace where

teachers' opportunities to observe one another and to communicate about their work are severely limited (Dreeben, 1970; Lortie, 1975). As a result, teachers are forced to become self-sufficient and to work independently. Hargreaves (1993) argues that isolation created by the architecture of school design offers teachers something they would naturally seek anyway -- privacy and individualism. He goes further to suggest that teacher isolation is the "base of their occupational culture" (p. 72) and that most teachers if given the choice would choose isolation over any type of collaborative effort. Hargreaves concludes that the idea that isolation has negative implications for teachers is unproven.

> Isolation is something that is self-imposed and actively worked for. It fends off the digressions and diversions involved in working with colleagues, to give focus to instruction with and for one's own students. Isolation in this view, then, is a sensible adaptive strategy to the work environment. (Hargreaves, 1993; p. 58)

Research in physical education has traditionally inferred that isolation is a negative aspect of teaching physical education in public schools (Locke & Griffin, 1986; Locke & Massengale, 1978). Whether it is positive or negative, physical educators are not spared from physical

isolation. The physical education literature has addressed this issue in some detail and implies that this problem of teacher isolation is even more severe for physical educators than for other teachers. Gymnasia, like classrooms, are self-sufficient cells within the school where teachers can close the door and teach in total isolation. Even in gymnasia where two teachers teach simultaneously, curtains are pulled, walls are erected, and separate teaching stations are created.

The physical location of gymnasia and teacher isolation. In addition to the isolation faced by classroom teachers due to the "egg-crate" design of schools, physical educators are subjected to further isolation as a result of the location of gymnasia in schools. Gymnasia are often located on building peripheries, where teachers are far away from routine contacts with other adults. This prevents physical education teachers from interacting with other teachers with the same frequency as that sustained or possible among classroom teachers. In turn, the isolated location of the gym discourages other teachers from visiting physical educators.

Often physical education teachers spend hours in their gyms with little opportunity to converse with any other adults. This is especially significant when one is the

only physical educator in the school -- which is common at some small secondary schools and at most elementary schools. These physical educators find themselves alone, not only cut off from regular contact with other physical educators who understand their work, but isolated from all interaction with school personnel.

Physically isolated from their colleagues, many physical educators ironically interpret this independence as autonomy. In many situations, secondary school physical education teachers have the freedom to teach whatever they wish and to evaluate students in whichever way they deem appropriate (Veal, 1988). They receive little, if any, critical evaluation by administrators. Most secondary physical education teachers would list this "autonomy" as one of their most desired workplace factors. Bain (1984), on the other hand, calls this "an autonomy born of neglect" and attributes it to a lack of support from school administration (p. 137).

The physical design of gymnasia. Unlike location of gymnasia and the isolated cell phenomenon shared with other teachers, a third physical aspect, one that has not been discussed in the physical education literature, is the physical design of gymnasia. In spite of the fact that school design has changed very little over several decades,

experimentation with open-spaced schools has been documented in the educational literature (Smith & Keith, 1971; Weinstein, 1979). Although open-spaced schools were designed for a variety of reasons, one that relates specifically to this research was to find an alternative to the "egg-crate" design of schools that would enhance teacher interdependence within the workplace. In stark contrast, school architects have not been prompted to find alternative designs for the traditional "gymnasium".

Gymnasia have been intentionally designed to accommodate athletics, most commonly basketball, only later adapted for physical education classes with a variety of other activities. With some exceptions (auxiliary rooms, indoor ropes courses, climbing walls, and multipurpose rooms), little attention has been given to the particular needs of physical education (e.g., class size, content variety, program goals, diverse ability levels) when designing physical education facilities. As a result, physical education teachers have historically been challenged to develop their indoor curricula to fit within the "basketball court" design restrictions of traditional gymnasia.

The physical education literature shows no attempts to consider alternatives to the "basketball court" design of gymnasia. School officials seem content to have physical

educators teach in facilities that are designed not for teaching physical education to large numbers of students with varying skill levels, but for staging athletic contests for an elite few who are highly skilled and highly motivated.

Other physical characteristics of concern to physical educators. Other physical characteristics of schools of particular concern to physical education teachers are temperature, acoustics and lighting. Many times gymnasia are either too cold or too hot. Large size makes gymnasia not only difficult to regulate in terms of temperature but also difficult to teach in because of acoustics. Lighting may be a problem because of too few windows, windows that are covered to protect them from balls and other sports equipment, or simply inadequate candle power in lighting provided to accommodate the distance and space from lighting source to activities. When the very subject matter requires students to be moving and active, it is crucial that heating, lighting and sound features of the setting do not detract from the learning environment.

Summary

These findings suggest that physical education teachers, like their colleagues, experience an intimate

relationship between their physical environment and their work. Physical educators work in classrooms where little opportunity is afforded to interact professionally with their colleagues. This is, in part, a result of the "egg-crate" design of schools (Lortie, 1975) and, in part, a result of teacher choice (Hargreaves, 1993).

In addition, educational researchers have given little attention to the physical design of schools. The general education literature indicates that there has been some attempt to experiment with school design to create alternative physical environments that would be more supportive of teachers' work. This has been encouraged because of findings that suggest a relationship between the physical characteristics of schools and teachers' work. Other investigators argue that traditional classroom design (isolated classroom cells) and physical location of classrooms encourage teacher separateness and independence.

Although there has been little discussion in the physical education literature about the relationship of gymnasium design to the work of physical education teachers, similar findings to those above indicate that the physical location of most gymnasia within schools, along with job descriptions that require physical educators to

supervise students inside locker rooms, cause physical education teachers to be isolated from their colleagues. This isolation decreases physical educators' opportunities to interact professionally with their colleagues and diminishes public visibility of physical education programs. With only a few instances mentioned in the physical education literature, the relationship of the physical characteristics of schools to physical educators and their work is not yet fully understood.

The Organizational Characteristics of the School as a Workplace

The physical characteristics of schools are only part of a teacher's work environment. It also is important to look at how schools are organized as communities of people to carry on the business of education and, more particularly, how teachers perceive their work in relation to this organizational structure. The literature on schools as organizations describes the explicit social and political parameters of schools as work environments for teachers.

Allaire and Firsirotu (1984) propose that organizations can be understood as sociocultural systems. This analysis defines what I have referred to in this paper

as the organizational aspect of schools. Allaire and Firsirotu define the sociocultural system as

> composed of the interworking of formal structures, strategies, policies and management processes, and of all ancillary components of an organization's reality and functioning (formal goals and objectives, authority and power structure, control mechanisms, reward and motivation, process of recruitment, selection and education, sundry management processes (p.213).

The key phrase here is "formal structures". The organizational aspects of the school are explicit and known to everyone in the workplace as the formal interworkings of the organization. Usually written in the form of school rules, regulations or policies, these organizational aspects of the workplace contrast with the cultural aspects of the school which tend to be informal, implicit and learned through personal networking and communication among groups and subgroups of teachers. The cultural aspects of schools will be discussed in more detail in the next section of this literature review.

The term "organization" implies orderliness. Within the physical structure of school buildings, schools are organized to carry out the business of education in an orderly manner. The general literature has provided us

with an understanding of this second aspect of schools as workplaces for teachers, the organizational structure. For the purpose of this paper the phrase "the school as an organization" refers to order within the school resulting from explicit systems or structures (as outlined by Allaire and Firsirotu above) that are in place to govern the day-to-day activities within an individual school.

General education literature has pointed out that although schools are similar to other organizations in some basic ways, they differ significantly in other ways that make teachers' lives in schools different from workers' lives in other organizations. Because schools share some characteristics with other types of organizations (e.g., churches, corporations, and businesses), it is helpful to understand how they are similar to other organizations. Information from organizational literature, however, should be considered carefully before applying it to schools. Although schools share some similarities with other types of organizations, the differences outweigh the similarities. Because of these differences, inferences cannot be extrapolated thoughtlessly from the organizational literature, and a careful comparison is required before attempting to apply findings from organizational literature to situations in school

organizations. Our understanding of schools as organizations and the implications for teachers' work can be greatly enhanced by recognizing how schools resemble and differ from other organizations.

How Schools Resemble Other Organizations

Like other complex organizations, schools have formal structures in place that help the organization maintain itself. Allaire and Firsirotu's (1984) definition presented six areas in which structures are firmly in place to guide the work in organizations: formal goals and objectives, authority and power, control mechanisms, reward and motivation, process of recruitment, selection and education, and sundry management processes. Lawson (1989) provides four examples of similar structures that are in place within school organizations to direct the work that teachers do in schools: a goal system, a resource allocation system, an evaluation system, and prestige and reward systems. Because schools are similar to other organizations in some basic ways, these authors provide comparable examples from the organizational literature and the education literature. Regardless of which particular structures are given as examples, these investigators suggest that these structures are firmly in place to

maintain order and continuity within the workplace. Lawson's examples will be used to illustrate how these structures function in schools and in turn guide the work of teachers.

A goal system orients the school staff toward singular or multiple purposes for a school such as heterogeneous grouping or the promotion of social tolerance among staff and students. Teachers within a particular school may or may not support these goals but in either case are responsible for communicating goals to students and parents.

A second system designates the allocation and distribution of resources such as equipment, facilities and funds. Teachers must identify their needs and communicate them through some formal process to heads of departments, principals, or school committees. Negotiations may then take place to determine who gets what in terms of the available resources.

Another system exists for the control, supervision and evaluation of teachers' work performance, and a fourth system establishes prestige and rewards for the people who work within the school. The last two systems vary greatly in the place they occupy in school life. The explicit evaluation and supervision of teachers' work is pervasive

in some schools and virtually nonexistent in others. The same is true of provisions for a system which apportions prestige and rewards.

How Schools Differ from Other Organizations

Although similarities between schools and other organizations can be found, there are major differences that make schools unlike other organizations. Unlike some organizations that are designed to be efficient and change their organizational structure when they are no longer meeting that goal, secondary schools have remained structurally the same in spite of changing demands. The secondary school is not effectively organized for the work that is expected of today's teachers and teachers do not agree about appropriate workplace conduct (Bruckerhoff, 1991).

In secondary schools, teachers are grouped spatially and organizationally into departments (Johnson, 1990). This is not unlike many other organizations. In schools, however, the particular department in which one is a member determines status within the organization. Teachers are grouped into departments according to the particular subject they teach. Johnson found that although teachers identified strongly with their departments, special subject

areas (art, business, music, physical education, industrial arts, home economics, special education, and bilingual education) were less likely to have consistent and predictable departmental structure. Departments of academic subjects were more clearly defined and members of these departments were afforded a higher status than those in "nonacademic subjects". In addition, departments in schools unlike those in other organizations are led by department heads who according to Johnson (1990) "act more as representatives and facilitators than as authorities" (pp. 176).

A careful and detailed comparison done by Handy and Aitken (1986) reveals four distinct differences between schools and other organizations and a fifth is contributed by Dreeben (1970, 1973). Schools have (a) no time for management, (b) a multitude of purposes, (c) the concept of role switching, (d) no advancement for teaching, and (e) students to serve. Understanding these differences will help us to become more sensitive to the unique organizational characteristics of the school as a workplace.

First, schools have no time or personnel for management when compared with business organizations with numerous full-time managers. Schools are organized with

one, two, or three top managers and only a few part-time managers (e.g., department heads in the case of secondary schools). These department heads combine managerial with teaching responsibilities and are clearly teachers first and managers second.

In spite of the fact that all teachers are managers, teachers are given little time or adequate space for their management responsibilities (e.g., attendance, budgets, equipment maintenance, follow-up to disciplinary actions, grades, student progress records). Conversely, in many other organizations managers are hired specifically to manage and are given adequate time, office space, supplies and equipment to aid their efforts. In addition, these managers are usually given additional secretarial assistance.

When teachers are given release time to address their managerial tasks they often find it difficult to work with other teachers because they rarely have the same free time. Although it is rare to see office space assigned to anyone other than a senior administrator, secondary school physical education teachers usually do have an office. When offices do exist, however, they are often located inside locker rooms and in large departments, shared among two or more teachers. This provides little privacy for

conversations to occur and limits accessibility to only those of similar gender. Teachers who do not have office space must carry out virtually all their work in classrooms which they share with students or in places which also have other uses (e.g., teachers' lounge, library, main office, or conference room).

In many other organizations, senior managers spend up to 60 percent of their time in meetings (Handy and Aitken, 1986). Teachers have little time available for meetings and must schedule these around their teaching (Woodilla, Dodds & Boscardin, 1993). Thus they must meet primarily during times that they consider their own (e.g., after school, before school, and during lunch breaks and preparation periods). It therefore becomes difficult for teachers to get all their managerial work done within school time.

A second way schools are different from other kinds of organizations is that they have a multitude of purposes. Unlike other organizations that have goals that are simple and easily understood (e.g., make a profit, keep the customer satisfied, produce a quality product), schools have many expectations placed upon them by society and are sometimes faced with conflicting expectations and no simple ways to measure success. Without a clear mission, there

are no criteria for deciding how to measure success or to allocate resources. It becomes difficult, therefore, to measure the progress of students, teachers, programs, or departments. All decisions become subjective and discussions among teachers and administrators escalate into political debates about priorities among various purposes.

As a result, teachers often find themselves caught in tenuous situations. They may or may not be clear about what is expected of them and their work. Teachers in the same school workplace may have very different ideas and opinions about what is expected of them. In addition, the school workplace may expect teachers to work towards several (perhaps conflicting) purposes at once.

A third difference between schools and other organizations is the concept of role switching. Most organizations hire specialists to fill specific job descriptions. Teachers' jobs are less specific and more likely to change. Although not always written in their job descriptions, teachers are often given responsibilities that require them to fill very different roles (e.g., administrator, coach, committee member, or department chair). Role switching can occur as a complete switch -- a teacher gives up teaching to become an administrator. More commonly, role switching occurs daily -- a teacher switches

from teacher to coach, teacher to committee member, or teacher to department chair. This constant switching of roles can cause teachers to feel role ambiguity, role conflict, or role strain.

Role ambiguity occurs when teachers are not clear about their role expectations. For example, a teacher who also is serving as a department head during tense times (e.g., when threatened with budget cuts) may not know how to respond to colleagues' questions about administrative decisions. The teacher wants to remain true to the role of a loyal friend and colleague as well as to the role of trusted administrator.

Role conflict may occur when teachers take on new roles in addition to teaching and are expected to do something totally opposite from what is expected of them in another role. For example, a teacher may experience role conflict when asked to be department chair in addition to a regular teaching load. As a teacher, this person has developed collegial relationships with the other teachers in the department and is considered as "one of the gang". In the managerial role, however, the same teacher is expected to observe and evaluate the effectiveness of these colleagues. This dual role may cause conflict in the way the teacher interacts with other teachers in the department

and vice versa. Additional roles that are common for physical education teachers are coaching, teaching health, and administering athletic programs.

Role strain occurs when teachers have two or more roles that compete for their time. Teachers who become president of the local teachers' union or coach an athletic team may find that this added role requires some of the time that was once devoted to teaching.

A fourth difference between schools and other organizations is that there is no opportunity for advancement within teaching. Teachers who want to advance have nowhere to go but out of teaching and into administration or completely out of education. In some cases, such an advance takes good teachers out of the classroom and into positions where they have increasingly less contact with students. There is a clear assumption in the school organization that good teachers make good managers and poor teachers make poor managers. Advancing or being promoted in a school system means a teacher must leave the classroom for administration, implying that career success means moving away from teaching and into managerial roles. Although this form of advancement is sought by some teachers, it often becomes difficult and competitive, because there are very few administrative positions available in schools.

Some good teachers are offered the reward of becoming part-time managers (department heads or head teachers). Many other organizations hire people trained in administration to fill managerial roles, while allowing their professionals to remain in the roles for which they were hired. In addition, people are rewarded for doing their jobs well and encouraged to continue as "masters" in their positions. Managers are given other names such as bursars, chief clerks, or administrators and work to serve the professionals who maintain the leadership within the organization.

A fifth characteristic that makes schools different from most other organizations is the students they serve. The students present a unique dilemma for teachers in terms of their relationship to the organization; it is unclear how students fit into the organizational structure. Are they workers, clients, or products? Handy and Aitken (1986) define a worker as a member of an organization who co-operates in a joint endeavor. A client is a beneficiary of the organization who is served by the endeavor. A product is the output which is shaped and developed by the organization. By these definitions, students may fulfill any of these roles. This confusion about where students fit into the organization structure of schools creates

ambiguity for teachers that is not experienced by workers in most organizations. Whether teachers see themselves as independent professionals with clients, as managers of groups of cooperating workers, or as shapers of products in the making makes a vast difference in teachers' work.

Although Handy and Aitken (1986) provide three very good options for how teachers may view the relationship of students to the workplace, Dreeben (1970; 1973) suggests a fourth alternative. He describes the students' affiliation with the school organization as "conscripts" whose membership is involuntary. Metz (1993) suggests that it is an elementary part of the teachers' organizational duty to control and engage these conscripts. Teachers who cannot do so are quickly reprimanded and lose respect from administrators, colleagues, and even students. This creates a unique situation that sets schools apart from most other organizations (with the exception of prisons). Having students as conscripts means that in addition to teaching, teachers must confront the problems of soliciting and maintaining the voluntary participation of students in class activities (Doyle, 1979; Metz, 1993). Schools thus are very different from business organizations due to the requirement that teachers must "win" the compliance of their students for the work to be accomplished.

In addition to having to "win" compliance, diversity within the student population is becoming more prominent. McLaughlin (1993) discovered that students were the workplace context of greatest consequence to teachers. As teachers are forced to deal with the varying needs of individuals and groups of today's students, this concern becomes magnified. In addition, as teachers are expected to deal with society's problems in schools (e.g., the AIDS epidemic, hate crimes, teenage pregnancy, teenage violence), time and energy are taken away from traditional instruction time. With less time available for instruction and an increasing challenge to win students' compliance, teachers' sense of identity is threatened. In order to feel some success teachers are using negotiation skills to bargain with students for their cooperation (Metz, 1993). Teachers adjust their own goals and expectations for student outcomes in exchange for students' cooperation in class (Metz, 1993; McLaughlin, 1993; Doolittle, 1993).

These negotiations have resulted in great variation among the expectations that teachers have for their teaching and their students. McLaughlin (1993) presented three general patterns of expectations found in her work: (a) maintain traditional standards, (b) lower expectations for coverage and achievement, and (c) adapt practices and

pedagogy. Doolittle (1993) provides a similar list of teacher expectations: (a) lowered expectations for learning, (b) emphasis on compliance instead of mastery, (c) activity instead of instruction, (d) increased acceptance of failure, and (e) limited content coverage. Teachers are responding to a factor in the school organization that makes teachers directly responsible for student learning. Because teachers cannot make students learn, they must focus their efforts on trying to get as many as possible to engage in the learning process. McLaughlin (1993) suggests that schools should organize in ways so that student success would become a collective responsibility.

In addition to the five-part analysis made by Handy and Aitken (1986) noted above, a sixth characteristic of schools differentiates them from other organizations is that school districts are microcosms of the community (Dreeben, 1973). Therefore, with the exception of magnet schools or districts under mandates for racial integration, the social composition of schools cannot be determined or changed by school personnel. Thus, most teachers can neither select their clientele nor teach only those whom they like or only those who are interested in or responsive to school activities.

This makes for a very difficult and sometimes even dangerous workplace for teachers. Many social problems can be brought into the classroom, and teachers not only must deal with enticing students to learn, but also must cope with wider social issues as drug abuse, child abuse, teenage suicide, and alcoholism. In many cases teachers are not trained to handle these problems, yet they must address these issues in order to have any chance of helping students learn.

In spite of some similarities between schools and other organizations, Handy and Aitken (1986) along with Dreeben (1970, 1973) have outlined some very important ways in which schools are different from other organizations. These differences should not be taken lightly, as they make schools unique and they help fabricate the peculiar relationship between schools as organizations and the teachers who work there.

Using Metaphors to Understand the Relationship Between Teachers and their Workplace

As hinted above, the nature of this research challenges us to look at the relationship of schools as organizations to teachers and their work. To gain an understanding of organizations and their relationships with

the people who work within them, metaphors can be used (Morgan, 1986; Smircich, 1983). Because organizations are "complex, ambiguous, and paradoxical" (Morgan, 1986, p.322), metaphors can be used to isolate or "frame" a particular segment of organizational life, allowing it to be magnified and brought into focus for observation. These metaphors can be used to magnify certain aspects of schools for examination and inquiry into the work environment and its relationship to teachers and their work.

Four metaphors were suggested by Smircich (1983) to illustrate the different ways in which organizations are conceptualized. Although other metaphors can also be used, these four will be presented with specific examples of their application to schools. The reader should remember that although there will be references made to external forces as part of the discussion of these metaphors, the ultimate focus will be the effect that these forces have on the internal organizational structure of the workplace.

The school as a machine. The first metaphor presents the organization as a machine. Morgan (1986) explains that this metaphor creates a vision of the organization as machine-like, made up of replaceable parts with the expectation that it will run in a routinized, efficient, reliable and predictable way.

In many ways, teachers' work in schools has become quite machine-like. Schedules govern teachers' workdays, standardized texts are used for continuity in content, standardized tests are given to measure student learning, and standard policies are made to govern all teachers' workloads. The school organization is expected to "run like a machine" to the extent that the teacher's workday is driven by clocks and bells.

Using the metaphor of the school as a machine allows us to focus on the mechanical nature of the workplace for teachers. Although not totally mechanical, some aspects of teachers' work are machine-like, and organizational policies and procedures are intermingled with teachers' work like orchestrated gears encased within a fine-tuned machine. Teachers do have some input into many aspects of the school organization by joining unions or serving on school or systemwide committees. Belonging to a union or serving on committees does not necessarily guarantee teachers will have input. Physical education teachers can, however, work with their colleagues and local teachers' union to fight for changes that would make teaching physical education in their schools more successful (e.g., smaller class size, homogeneous grouping, increased required hours). Teachers' unions can be seen as serving

in many cases to "standardize" things in ways that make the machine metaphor all the more appropriate.

The organization as a machine is an image that is not new to any of us. Applied to physical education, this framework implies that bureaucratic structures are firmly in place to guide and standardize the work physical educators do in schools. The machine metaphor portrays the school organization as being made up of many replaceable parts working together to drive the machine and unfortunately, physical educators too often get the message that they are replaceable. Organizational messages in the form of large class sizes, mixed ability levels, low budget priority, and low scheduling priority communicate to physical educators that they are not necessarily crucial to the functioning of the machine.

Nevertheless, physical education teachers experience many of the same machine-like routines experienced by other teachers. One example is the organization of the work day into time segments assigning teachers to certain places at certain times with certain students. Even lunch breaks and toilet breaks are taken according to a pre-determined schedule. Thus, like their colleagues, physical education teachers have little flexibility in their work day and must learn to function according to externally imposed

schedules. Some, of course, may perceive schedules as being rigid, while others may enjoy the structure they provide.

A second example is the bureaucratic structure of salaries. Physical educators, along with their colleagues, are salaried employees and consent by contract to perform very specific jobs, work within the bureaucratic hierarchy of the organization, and follow certain rules in relation to their work (Dreeben, 1973). Salaries have become standard, based on a step system that pays teachers a pre-determined salary according to the number of years experience they have and their level of education.

Some argue that teachers generally are underpaid and that this system of remuneration makes it difficult to attract new teachers to the profession, retain those teachers who are good and encourage teachers to grow and improve. The system also ignores quality performance and allows poor teachers to remain in schools. As a result, mediocrity is usually the norm in schools and excellence comes usually because of individually-held professional standards (Templin, 1983) rather than school-induced incentives. There are very few extrinsic rewards for teachers to do better or pressures on teachers to improve.

Written policies and organizational procedures exist that indicate the amount and quality of organizational

commitment a school has for its physical education programs. Physical education-related policies often include information about who is required to take how many credits of physical education, whether or not physical education is part of a student's graduation requirements, whether evaluation procedures for grading in physical education are the same as in other subjects, how physical education classes are scheduled, class sizes in physical education compared with those in other subjects, and school policies for excusing students from classes. A great deal can be learned about a school's commitment to its physical education program by studying both explicit policies and what is left unstated.

Unlike many other subjects, physical education is not influenced by a commonly agreed-upon universal curriculum. Subjects such as math and science have national standards and testing that directly influence what is taught in math and science classes across America. With the exception of fitness tests, physical education is not influenced by any type of national testing. Unless state curriculum guides are available, every secondary school physical education program operates independently. Many operate independently even when state curriculum guides do exist.

Some secondary school physical educators are required to incorporate a state mandated curriculum when it is

available. Others work with their school districts to develop a district-wide curriculum. Many develop their own curriculum independent of any other school and some do not even have a curriculum guide of any kind. Even in schools where curriculum guides are accessible, many teachers are not held accountable for using them. They exist only as a formality, collecting dust on a shelf (Dodds, 1983). As a result, physical educators feel free to teach activities that they enjoy and conversely avoid teaching activities with which they are uncomfortable.

Partly because of this lack of a commonly agreed-upon curriculum, physical education teachers lack a shared technology and a common language. For example, secondary school physical education teachers do not use professional conference time discussing where their students scored on certain skills tests or at what level of fitness are their ninth graders, because there are few expectations that testing even occurs in physical education (Veal, 1988). Physical educators are not expected to share the results of their teaching with colleagues within their own schools. Teaching physical education in secondary schools is generally a private matter not even discussed with teachers and administrators in the same building.

The school as an organism. A second metaphor that highlights a different perspective on the school workplace is the organization as an organism. This metaphor comes from a biological paradigm and alludes to such issues as survival, the relationship of the organization to its environment, and the organization's effectiveness in maintaining critical homeostatic balances. The metaphor of organization as an organism operates on the premise that employees are people with complex needs, and that these needs must be met by the workplace in order for employees to be satisfied. A second premise is that organizations, like organisms, are open to their environment and must achieve an appropriate and mutually beneficial balance in relation to that environment if they are to survive.

Schools are influenced directly by their environment and as a result, the work of teachers is also affected. Schools are dependent on financial support from the outside community and are subject to shifts in economic circumstances and public opinion. Teachers and students pass in and out of schools daily, carrying with them such influences as social prejudices, local attitudes about the value of education, expectations concerning vocational preparation, and beliefs about the effectiveness of teachers. Not only must school organizations learn to

survive in the face of this influx, but teachers also must juggle these influences with respect to the formal goals of the school and with their own personal attitudes, goals, and abilities.

Teachers in many states across the country, for example, currently are engaged in a struggle to survive and function within the constraints of tightening economic conditions in their local communities. Schools must compete for tax revenues with other local services such as police and fire protection. Teachers and their unions are thus forced to defend the importance of their work and fight for the monies needed to ensure sound educational programs. With this struggle comes the possibility that teachers will feel less valued in the eyes of the community, or even come to feel directly threatened. Physical education teachers have become especially vulnerable within this struggle to survive. Physical education programs are often considered first when budget cuts threaten the vitality of the school organization and as a result, physical educators often feel threatened within their own workplace.

The metaphor, school as an organism, cues in on one of the areas where physical education is struggling in the workplace -- survival. In most secondary schools, physical

education is a marginal subject and teachers receive little real support for their programs. Within the school community, physical educators find themselves on the bottom of a hierarchical pecking order. Smyth (1993), in a study examining first year physical education teachers' perceptions of their workplace, concluded that physical educators experienced their first year in the workplace differently from first year classroom teachers. First year physical educators did, however, struggle with the same survival issues as veteran physical education teachers. This was in part because of the marginal status of physical education in the workplace and its ultimate struggle to survive in schools. Smyth listed the following as obstacles in the struggle to survive the first year of teaching physical education: (a) the reality of teaching a subject which was accorded low status, (b) expectations to teach under unrealistic time constraints with inadequate facilities and few resources, (c) lack of accountability for student learning, (d) no consensus on appropriate educational outcomes, and (e) teacher evaluation that focused primarily on class management and compliance with school regulations.

As a result of this struggle for survival, the school environment has become a hostile one for many physical

educators who find they must fight to keep their programs alive. Physical education has been put on the endangered species list (Siedentop, 1987) and researchers have questioned whether or not secondary school physical education, in its present form, is worth saving (Dodds & Locke, 1984). If it is to survive, physical education needs to renegotiate its relationship within the school organization. This may mean redesigning and recreating secondary school physical education as we now know it in order to survive and secure a healthy relationship within the school organization.

Although community influence is an outside force, its impact is felt within the school in terms of either general support or apathy. The public often confuses physical education with athletics, more often than not ignoring physical education because they are primarily interested in athletics. Decisions about physical education programs may result from parents' and other community members' lack of interest in their children's physical education programs. When pressured for budget decisions, administrators will often take the path of least resistance and delete physical education.

The school as theater. A third metaphor, schools as theater, directs the spotlight to yet another aspect of the

relationship teachers have with their workplace. This metaphor refers to organizations as theaters for the performance of dramas, roles, and scripts. People are hired to play certain roles within the organization and are expected to abide by appropriate scripts. Teachers are hired to teach in the classroom and are expected to play their roles as directed by formal school rules and policies and by the expectations of others (e.g., administration, students, parents, or community at large).

Actors (the administrators, teachers, students and other supporting roles) can sway significantly the dynamics of the play and the way the script is played out. If a strong actor is cast into the role of principal, the play will take on a different dynamic than if a weaker actor takes this role. A strong teacher would certainly have implications for the physical education program that a less dynamic personality would not provide. For example, a strong teacher may fight for a change in the scheduling policies for physical education, encourage parental participation, and lobby the school committee for additional physical education time for students whereas a weaker teacher may simply accept the situation as it is.

The cast of characters will vary in their abilities to perform their roles and in their interpretations of their

parts. Interactions also will change as actors move on due to transfers or retirements and replacements are hired. To conclude this metaphor, school as theater brings to center stage the dynamic interplay among the actors and the influences of individual personalities on the outcomes of the total performance.

School as theater allows us to look closely at the role of physical educators in secondary schools. Who plays the role of the secondary physical education teacher? Many times, teaching is a career contingency for coaching (Templin, 1987), that is, physical education teachers are often hired by school committees based on their potential or record as coaches rather than for their success in teaching (Bain, 1983). In many cases, physical educators, as part of their script, are expected to coach.

In addition, physical education often attracts individuals who want to coach and choose teaching physical education as a means to that end. This creates a situation that has been addressed in the physical education literature as teacher/coach role conflict (Locke & Massengale, 1978; Sage, 1989). Many high school physical education teachers teach a full day of classes and then begin the second half of their day when the dismissal bell rings in the afternoon (Cox, 1987). Many believe coaching

is the more important and interesting aspect of their work. They often struggle with the demands that each role places on them during their workday, and very few are able to be successful in both physical education instruction and athletic coaching (Cox, 1987).

This particular metaphor singles out two additional points. One focuses on the particular expectations of physical education provided for in the script of the school. The other allows us to look at other actors and their impact on the outcome of the total performance.

Most secondary school physical education teachers are exposed to very little instructional leadership. Very few principals hold specific expectations for significant outcomes in high school physical education programs and few visit the gymnasium unless problems arise that demand their immediate attention. When principals do evaluate physical education teachers, they rarely know what good instruction resembles in this subject area. As long as students in physical education classes look "busy, happy and good" (Placek, 1983) most high school principals will assume that the physical educators are doing a good job. Nevertheless, perhaps because of lack of leadership "secondary school physical education is laden with outdated curricula, rote instruction, and poor methods of evaluation" (Lambert, 1987, p. 30).

Students are cast in a very significant role in terms of the work that physical education teachers do in schools. Student actors have a direct impact on the actual performance of physical educators. This is partially because students in schools are involuntary conscripts (Dreeben, 1973). While this is not an issue that is exclusive to physical education, since school itself is involuntary, it does create problems that are specific to physical education.

In most schools where physical education is required, students must pass a certain number of credits of physical education. Although students have to be in physical education classes, they are not always willing to participate. Nonparticipation in physical education classes often take the form of deliberate public displays of noncompliance (e.g., not changing into appropriate attire for participation, not trying, standing on the sidelines and observing). Students' interest in physical education will usually affect their participation in classes (Portman, 1992). Some students will not participate, others will not show up for class, and still others will try to influence teachers' decisions about how to run class (e.g., just play the games, offer only popular sports, make classes fun). Students who do not want to be

in physical education classes or students who have strong expectations about what classes should be like can make the job of teaching physical education difficult and sometimes impossible (Carlson, 1993).

The school as a political arena. Schools as political arenas is a fourth metaphor used to understand the school organization. This metaphor brings into sharp focus the relationships among various interest groups, the presence of conflict, and the various uses of power within schools and between schools and their surrounding communities. Organizational politics arise when individuals or groups of people think differently, and as a result, form political groups desiring alternative paths of action (Morgan, 1986). Power distributions vary within different schools for many reasons. Some schools have a very powerful administrator in place while others have a strong teachers' union, strong individual teachers, or a cohesive informal teacher network. Some school districts have powerful parent groups or school committees with specific political agendas. Power distributions also will vary among teachers according to specific issues. Teachers usually will have more passion for those political issues that affect their work most directly.

In the formal sense, power in schools is distributed among people in terms of their job descriptions. The power that teachers actually have in schools will vary, but the power apportioned most explicitly to teachers usually is earmarked for use in their own classrooms. Teachers as individuals frequently have little formal power over the major decisions made for the school organization as a whole, in spite of the fact that these decisions have consequences for their work (e.g., decisions that center around budgeting, scheduling, distribution of resources and hiring of colleagues) (Louis & Smith, 1990). On the other hand, teachers in groups (local teachers' unions, state and national teachers' associations, and specific subject area associations) have significantly more power with which to influence working conditions in schools.

While teachers have more power in groups, other constituent groups such as administrators, school board members, parents, taxpayers, and students also have power to protect their special interests in terms of what teachers do in schools and classrooms. Examples of the use of this power have resulted in such political issues as students refusing to participate in certain activities because of religious beliefs, parents censoring books used

in classes, school board members mandating certain curriculum guidelines, taxpayers refusing to support school budget decisions, and administrators demanding certain teaching styles (e.g., cooperative learning). Secondary school physical educators have commonly felt political pressure to maintain traditional sports in their curriculum. Grading procedures have also come under political fire. When grading includes written exams and students receive poor grades because they are not willing to study for tests in physical education, parents become angry and utilize their political power. With all these groups having power in decisions that directly control teachers' work in the classroom, teachers often find themselves struggling in the middle of the political arena.

As noted above, the metaphor of the school as a political arena reminds us of the many different groups which influence decisions about teachers' work and teachers' workplaces. Schools are governed both by state statute and by local government and ultimately must be governed by the will of taxpayers. Power is exerted by individuals and groups at each of these levels of influence, all of which have the potential to influence teachers' work. Because everyone has some power -- even when the right of influence is limited by explicit law or

policy -- there are constant negotiations taking place, both formally and informally, as people associated with schools react and interact within this political arena.

Differences among physical education programs are due in part to the outside influence of state regulations for physical education. Individual state mandates govern some of the operations of high school physical education programs (e.g., required number of hours students must take physical education, teacher certification regulations). Further, the extent to which particular schools respond to state mandates contributes to this diversity among physical education programs. Some state laws require that students spend a minimum number of hours taking physical education, but others have no such requirement. While some schools may offer only the minimum number of required hours, others may offer more. Although more time does not necessarily guarantee higher quality programs, it does imply an attitude of support for physical education that offering only the bare minimum does not.

State requirements for physical education vary from state to state and in some states are even nonexistent. Approximately 60 percent of the states require no physical education or fewer than 300 hours of instruction across 13 years of schooling (Mitchell & Earls, 1987). In some

situations, it is the state's requirements that keep physical education in the secondary schools -- even if only with a marginal status (Hendry, 1975; Sparks, Templin, & Schempp, 1990). The reality for many school districts is that if states did not legally require a minimum amount of physical education, their high school physical education programs would be abolished. As it is, many schools offer the bare minimum required by law.

In response to various workplace demands, teachers have organized themselves into unions as a way of gaining power to negotiate the details for many of the working conditions mentioned above. Some teachers' unions have become very creative in this process and have actually changed the traditional organizational structure of their schools, thus making teachers' jobs easier and more meaningful, and their teaching more effective. Other teachers' unions negotiate within the traditional organizational structure of their schools, working within these boundaries trying to adjust the working conditions to meet the needs of both teachers and administrators. The existence of teachers' unions has given teachers a voice in some of the organizational factors affecting them in schools. These unions have been able to help physical educators influence some of the conditions of their jobs.

An example of this is that in some cases physical educators have been able to remove the condition of mandatory coaching as part of their teaching contracts.

Summary

Regardless of which metaphor one chooses to use for gaining insight into the school organization, as in other kinds of organizations formal structures in place within each individual school coordinate the work lives of the teachers within that school while maintaining its operation as an organization. This organizational structure acts as a guide to inform teachers explicitly about some of the things they should and should not do and about how things should be done in terms of overtly communicated rules, regulations and policies.

Many organizational factors play an important part in influencing how a physical education teacher will act in a variety of situations. Hall (1977) argues that much of the behavior in organizations results from how the organization trains, indoctrinates, and persuades its members to respond on the basis of the requirements of their jobs. Role expectations are determined by the broader organizational context. For example, in situations where physical education teachers are not carefully supervised by

administrators, teachers who are pinched for time due to coaching responsibilities may believe that it is appropriate to use class time to plan athletic practices or to deal with team conflicts. A second example is that classroom teachers who have homerooms are required to be in their classrooms before students arrive, while special subject teachers (art, music, physical education) are not always assigned to a homeroom. As a result, the latter may have flexible time and choose to have a cup of coffee in the teachers' room before school begins while the classroom teachers are required to be in classrooms to meet students as they arrive. Both groups generally accept this differential as a matter of natural circumstance. They do so, however, because it is a typical organizational routine.

Learning the explicit ways schools are organized is only a part of what physical education teachers must learn when they begin work in a new workplace. The teacher socialization literature describes in detail how people learn to become physical education teachers (Dodds, 1989; Doolittle and Schwager, 1989; Lawson, 1983, 1989; Schempp, 1989). After four years of professional training in colleges and universities, there still is much to be learned that can only come from experience in a specific

workplace (Lawson, 1989; Martinek, 1989; Templin, 1989). Important aspects of learning on the job involve learning to work within the physical setting of the school or learning the explicit organizational structure; but the more powerful lessons frequently are associated with the informal and often hidden structures and rules of the school -- i.e., key components of organizational culture. The next section of this literature review addresses school culture, the shared ways of communicating, believing, evaluating, and acting that are negotiated among people within a particular school or a subgroup such as physical educators.

The Cultural Characteristics of the School as a Workplace

Culture as a Metaphor

Previously, metaphors were used to help understand the organizational aspects of the school work environment. Using metaphors was useful in illuminating certain aspects of the organization by bringing specific properties into focus. School as a culture is a metaphor that can be used to illuminate a third and very crucial characteristic of the school workplace for teachers -- the cultural domain.

Culture as a metaphor can be used to help understand schools as organizations of people, specifically focusing

on the interactive patterns of humans as they make meaning of the world around them. Culture as a root metaphor for organization redirects "...our attention away from some of the commonly accepted 'important things' (such as structure or technology) and toward the (until now) less frequently examined elements raised to importance by the new metaphor (such as shared understandings, norms, or values)" (Jelinek, Smircich, & Hirsch, 1983, p. 331).

While the influence of culture remains vague and elusive both to teachers trying to understand their role inside schools and to outsiders trying to understand schools, the use of a cultural perspective provides an authentic view of schools as places where teachers work. Although schools share some similarities, focusing on the cultures of schools allows us to see individual differences created by human influence and thus prevents us from assuming that all schools are alike. The culture metaphor forces us to go inside to look for specific idiosyncrasies that determine how things <u>really are</u>, as opposed to <u>how things ought to be</u> in every school.

Although schools share similar cultural characteristics that set them apart from other organizations (e.g., churches, hospitals, the military, or prisons), "schools are alike only in gross characteristics,

differing in ethos, population, staff, character, climate, structure, circumstance, and history. [These] differences can be critical." (Cooper, 1988 p. 48). The cultural perspective brings outsiders closer to understanding schools as teachers do by providing a lens for identifying the specific human characteristics of a school that make it a unique place.

Organizational Culture

The concept of culture has traditionally been linked with research in the organizational literature. Much of the interest in learning about organizational culture has been prompted by the desire to improve methods of management and control (Smircich, 1983). Culture has recently received more attention in education and physical education literature. In much the same way, interest in studying the culture of schools has been prompted both by a desire to shape educational change and to better understand schools and the processes of teaching and learning within them.

Allaire and Firsirotu (1984) provide a typology of organizational concepts by focusing on various theories of culture (readers who are interested in a detailed review of cultural theories will find their work particularly

helpful). Their analysis suggests that the study of organizational culture has taken two primary directions. One, at the macro level, has been the focus on society's culture and its impact on the organization. The second, at the micro level, has been on the cultural properties of the organization itself. It is this second focus that is of interest here. Adopting this focus means accepting the notion that schools have cultural properties of their own. Allaire & Firsirotu's (1984) review focused on several studies in the organizational theory literature that support this premise (Baker, 1980; Eldridge & Crombie, 1974; Handy, 1976; Henderson, 1979; Hofstede, 1980, 1981; Ouchi, 1981; and Pettigrew, 1979).

The primary purpose of the current study is to focus inside schools and to gain an understanding of school cultures and how they relate to teachers' work in schools. Outside cultural influences do exist and do exert influences on schools and on teachers' work. Although it is difficult to isolate schools from these external forces, it is the purpose of this section to gain an understanding of the cultural properties of schools and their effect on teachers and on teachers' work.

Definition of Culture

A social organizational perspective of the school as a workplace was used by Rosenholtz (1989) to illustrate what

I have identified as school culture. Rosenholtz argues that "the ultimate social organizational variable is the meaning that the organization has for those who work within it" (p. 3). Therefore, in order "to understand schools, we must understand them as teachers do; that is, we must attempt to construe how schools appear to [the] teachers who inhabit them" (Rosenholtz, 1989, p. 3).

The basic principle behind Rosenholtz's work is that people come to define reality by sharing assumptions and beliefs about appropriate attitudes and behaviors for their particular workplace. Teachers observe other teachers at work in their building, name and classify the details of their work, talk to other teachers about work and thus make meaning for themselves about their own work. Teachers continually exchange ideas about their meanings for work and working in their school, negotiate for shared meanings, and constantly adjust those meanings. This process establishes and defines the conduct of everyday actions and interactions within the school. Teachers begin to act in ways that they believe they are expected to act (Rosenholtz, 1989). Rosenholtz points out that although teachers differ substantially in their individual biographies and that these differences may cause deviations in teachers' perceptions of reality, certain shared aspects

of work cut across these individual biographies to explain patterns of beliefs and behaviors in schools.

Schein's (1985) definition of organizational culture parallels Rosenholtz's social organizational view of schools as places where teachers work:

> ...a pattern of basic assumptions - invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration - that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 9)

School culture, then, may be thought of as an invisible and largely tacit faculty handbook that names the rules within which teachers are expected to work. The culture informs teachers about "what is okay" and "what is not okay" in their school for a variety of situations. These cultural rules are not spelled out explicitly and teachers may not even be consciously aware of them. While not always articulated, they are a fundamental basis for what teachers consider to be the rules for their personal and professional behavior in a school and they are communicated through behavior, language, and products (artifacts such as handbooks, memoranda, or schedules).

Moreover, teachers are not passive readers of school culture. Even new teachers are active participants in creating, defining, and communicating the norms and behaviors that are accepted in their particular workplace. Culture is created and continuously recreated by ongoing negotiations between people who believe their ideas to be the best for a particular situation.

Schein (1985) presented six properties of organizational culture. They are used here with examples that apply to the physical education setting: (a) observed behavioral regularities (e.g., talking informally with students before and after classes), (b) norms that evolve in the working group (e.g., informal dress code for teachers), (c) dominant values espoused by an organization (e.g., teachers value student conformity to behavioral norms), (d) philosophy that guides an organization (e.g., team sports curriculum model), (e) rules of the game for getting along in the organization (e.g, teacher autonomy -- you teach your way, let me teach mine), and (f) the feeling or climate conveyed in an organization by the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact with outsiders (e.g., physical separation of the men's and the women's office space). Schein suggests that these six properties "are shared by members of an

organization, operate unconsciously, and define in a basic taken-for-granted fashion an organization's view of itself and its environment" (Schein, 1985, p. 6).

Common Teaching Cultures

Although this paper focuses on the internal cultures of individual schools, the influence of broader teaching cultures should not go unmentioned. Zeichner (1986) suggests that there has been an incorrect assumption in some research that teachers are socialized into a uniform teacher culture. Instead, he suggests that several teaching cultures may operate even in a single school and that at times these cultures may even conflict. Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) report that "Teaching cultures are embodied in the work-related beliefs and knowledge teachers share - beliefs about appropriate ways of acting on the job and rewarding aspects of teaching, and knowledge that enables teachers to do their work" (p. 508).

All teachers are bound together by a common teaching culture that provides them with a great deal of insight into the role of teaching. In addition, broad cultures can also form around content areas. That is, physical education teachers everywhere share certain norms, values and beliefs about physical education and about teaching

physical education based on shared knowledge and experiences from their preparation for teaching and their contact with other physical educational professionals (both prior to and following their professional preparation).

With some exceptions, physical educators accept certain norms and values about physical education and sport that influence their work just as they share certain content knowledge and educational experiences that affect their programs. Subcultures strongly influence teachers because they usually associate with groups who share common beliefs. As a result, when looking outside of the individual workplace, this broad physical education subculture probably has more influence on how physical educators perceive their work than does the larger common teaching culture.

School Culture: The Differences in Cultural Properties of Individual Schools

The six common properties of organizational culture presented by Schein (1985) can be used to focus our attention on the cultural characteristics of individual schools. These cultural properties exist with varying degrees of influence as part of any given school's culture. Because these cultural properties are so basic

and are experienced by teachers at the subconscious level, they may not be easily defined by teachers. As a result, the school's culture may be especially difficult for new teachers to decipher or for experienced teachers to explain to their new colleagues.

Unlike the school's explicit organizational structure that mostly can be understood through examination of written policy, the school's culture is usually implicit and must be interpreted by each individual teacher in relation to his/her specific workplace. Even experienced teachers who transfer from one school to another will have to spend time learning the particular culture of their workplace. Despite Sarason's (1982) argument that certain regularities are common in all schools (e.g., programmatic regularities and behavioral regularities) and Feiman-Nemser and Floden's (1986) support for the idea of a common teaching culture, one research question of this dissertation centers on the differences among the cultural properties of individual schools.

All teachers must learn the specific idiosyncrasies of the culture of the school in which they are employed. More specifically, individual teachers' work is defined by the specific school in which they teach and more directly by the specific circumstances in which they find themselves

(e.g., particular subject area, physical location of classroom, daily schedule). Regardless of whether teachers are experienced or novice, when they take a new job in a different school, they must learn how to teach in that school.

Teachers Must Learn Their School's Culture

Hints from the school's culture will help new teachers understand what is expected of them in various situations and ultimately help them to learn their role in their new school. Cultural properties, such as those outlined by Schein (1985), can give teachers ideas about which aspects of their work can be understood by learning the school's culture. For example, although not written in any handbook on policy, teachers must develop clear ideas for how teachers in their school should interact with others. Not all teachers will agree on minor details but all will be broadly aware of what is expected of them and use this knowledge to gauge their own behavior.

Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) refer to four "norms for interaction" that shape the way teachers perceive their work with students, other teachers, administrators, and parents. These norms for interaction are not usually addressed in great detail in preservice programs since they

are dictated by each separate workplace. Through observation on the job, teachers identify behavior patterns that are interpreted as the normal behavior of interaction for teachers in their school. Based on this knowledge, teachers make choices for their own behavior.

Two contrasting situations may illustrate these interactional norms referred to above. In one particular school it may be expected that teachers attend extracurricular activities to support students, form collegial relationships to improve teaching, speak freely with senior administrators in their building about anything that is of importance or concern to them, and communicate with parents regularly about the children in their classes. These expectations would certainly create a workplace that differs markedly from another school where the expectations may be that teachers leave school at the time of student dismissal, keep to themselves in terms of their teaching practices, use a designated line of command to communicate their concerns to the administration, and communicate with parents only when problems arise.

The norms for interaction are just one of the many cultural properties that teachers must learn about their schools. Whether it is done intentionally or not, the school's culture must be learned and the sooner it is done,

the better! Learning a school's culture is crucial for teachers during their first year in a new school. It is then that teachers learn how to do their job and what is expected of them as teachers in the school. It is the culture that more than anything else defines the differences between schools as well as how teachers are expected to carry out their work within an individual school.

There is ample evidence that teachers learn something about what is expected of them through their apprenticeship of observation as students during twelve or more years in the public schools (Lortie, 1975; Schempp, 1989). Zeichner and Gore (1990) suggested that the experiences of preservice teacher education also provide some insight into the cultures of teaching (see also Lawson, 1988, 1989). These socialization experiences, however, can only help preservice teachers understand part of what will be expected of them in the workplace. Certain site-specific expectations are not revealed until the teacher takes his or her first job. Unique school cultures present situations different from those previously encountered in the apprenticeship of observation or the preservice teacher education experience. These norms of behavior will be workplace specific and must be learned during the crucial induction years.

Subcultures

Although schools have cultural properties (e.g., behavioral regularities, norms, values, philosophy, rules, and climate) that are commonly shared among most of the teachers who work within their walls, schools also have subcultures. Subcultures form when groups of teachers share very strong cultural properties that are different from those of the overall school culture. Teachers may have membership in several different subcultures, each having differing amounts of influence.

Subcultures may form when teachers share such common conditions as (a) the specific department in which a teacher works (e.g., math, science, physical education), (b) the grade level at which a teacher works (middle school, high school, sophomores, seniors), (c) the physical location of a teacher's classroom (north wing, senior wing, second floor, close to the central administrative offices of the school), (d) the age or experience level of the teacher (first-year teacher, twenty-year veteran), and (e) social group memberships. Subcultures can also form around a variety of other commonalities (gender, age, personal interest). This does not suggest that every group that forms within a school is necessarily a subculture. Subcultures form when groups of people share very strong

cultural properties (e.g., behavioral regularities, norms, values, philosophy, rules, and climate) that are different from those of the overall school culture or of those of other subcultures.

Secondary teachers' work is influenced by their membership in competing or conflicting subcultures from which they must draw information about their work (Little and McLaughlin, 1993b). These subcultures may act as ..."counter-cultures competing to define the nature of situations within [the] organizational boundaries" (Smircich, 1983, p. 346). Veal et al. (1990) suggest that subcultures, along with different teaching assignments, influence how teachers learn to teach and suggest that subcultures may develop based on the nature of teachers' work in particular subject areas. Teachers' membership in different subcultures may be a result of circumstance (e.g., professional membership in a department) or personal choice (e.g., social membership in a group of like-minded people).

Because subcultures are smaller subdivisions of the larger school community, they provide teachers with a safe arena to communicate, engage in intimate conversations, and share personal opinions and ideas. The specific subcultures in which teachers are members provide them with

an immediate and consistent reference (to whom teachers talk, the content of their conversations, what they believe to be important) from which they continually interpret their workplace and define their jobs. In these subcultures, teachers are intimately exposed to specific routines, interactions, rules, roles, relationships, and realities that result in very distinct views about their workplace (Rossman et al., 1988).

Depending on their situation, teachers can have membership in several different subcultures, each with varying degrees of influence on the teacher's understanding of both work and workplace. In return, teachers influence the subcultures in which they are members. Although teachers may be members of several different subcultures, one or two specific subcultures usually have more powerful influences on their understanding of their workplace and their work.

The Department as a Subculture

The department in which one is a member has a strong influence on teachers' understanding of their work and is very often the nucleus of a teacher's workplace. It is usually within the department that the most immediate aspects of teachers' work are negotiated. Unlike

elementary teachers who usually are generalists in isolated classrooms communicating to few others besides the children in their charge, secondary teachers congregate around subject matter (Johnson, 1990). Most secondary teachers are members of departments (e.g., English, math, physical education) in which specific cultural properties (e.g., behavioral regularities, norms, values, philosophy, rules, and climate) relating to subject area are shared (Talbert, 1993).

Johnson (1990) discovered that secondary school teachers identify strongly with their departments even when they are members of other groups. Talbert's (1993) work also points to the departmental subculture as having a strong influence on teachers. Talbert suggests that

> in most high schools, teachers' professional identities are shaped by subject cultures - within which special standards and routines of good practice are defined and between which status and resources are allocated - and teacher communities are forged, more or less, within subject matter enclaves (p. 164).

This suggests that even though teachers may simultaneously be members of several subcultures, the departmental subculture may have the strongest influence on teachers' perceptions about their workplace.

The Physical Education Department as a Subculture

Most secondary school physical education teachers are members of a department. Although some are members of a department comprised solely of physical educators, others are members of a department including both health and physical educators. The organizational formation of a department will affect its cultural influence. Those departments made up of teachers who share the same content area and a similar job description will be different from those departments whose members' expertise varies.

In addition to their assigned departments, physical educators may be members of other subcultures. Physical education borrows some of its unique identity from the sport culture. Many physical educators were members of high school or college athletic teams (Dodds, Placek, Doolittle, Ratliffe, Portman & Pinkham, 1992). From these experiences they learned the culture of sport (e.g., values hard work, self-discipline, survival of the fittest, winning). Although experiences vary based on participation in different sports (e.g., football, wrestling, gymnastics, swimming) and men and women experienced sport differently, shared experiences in sport give physical educators a common ground, an understanding that is not shared with other groups of teachers in the school but is shared with

other people in the world of sport and with other physical educators.

In the workplace, secondary physical education teachers are also part of a large subculture that is shared by other secondary school teachers. These teachers share the cultural characteristics of living and working in high schools (e.g., subject specialists, teaching several classes a day to different groups of students, the age of the students they teach). In addition, the role of secondary physical education teachers is usually quite different from that of elementary physical education teachers (and very often secondary teachers afford themselves higher status than elementary teachers).

Unlike teachers in other high school departments, many physical education teachers in secondary schools have offices that are located in locker rooms. There is rarely a common room in which the men and women share office space. The physical location of the offices creates a situation for physical educators that is not experienced by teachers in other departments. Having offices in the locker rooms physically divides the department by gender. In departments of two, one male and one female, the physical education teachers work alone in their offices and must consciously plan time to work together. In

departments where there are several teachers, the men and the women physical educators spend their office time in segregated groups and as a result, may form even smaller subcultures of their own.

The job description of a secondary school physical education teacher will often include coaching responsibilities, creating another group in which secondary school physical educators may have membership. Those teachers who coach athletic teams may find themselves in a subculture sharing common attitudes and displaying behaviors that are unique to their group. In addition, many secondary school physical education teachers identify more strongly with their role as a coach than with their role as a physical education teacher. As a result, their membership in the subculture of coaching may be more important than their membership in the subculture of physical education teaching (Locke & Massengale, 1978).

The physical location of a teacher's gymnasium could create a circumstance in which the physical educators spend time with colleagues from other subject areas who are located in the same general area of the building. As a result of such prolonged association, a subculture may form across subject matter lines. On the other hand, in situations where the gymnasium is physically isolated,

physical education teachers may have little daily contact with other teachers in the building. This may cause the physical educators to spend more time together and as a result strengthen their own subculture.

Summary

To close, I have proposed a cultural perspective as a third broad way of thinking about schools as enormously complex political and social organizations. The value of using culture as part of a framework for understanding schools as places where teachers work lies in its pervasive application to the business of education. That is, teachers work within a local culture that is subdivided into subcultures. These cultures and subcultures consist of shared assumptions, norms, values and rules for getting along and must be understood by teachers in order for them to function efficiently within their school, since much of what teachers do is in response to their surrounding culture. Because both teaching and learning occur within the context of these cultures, not to include school culture as a workplace factor for teachers would exclude a crucial and integral piece of the total picture.

Conclusion

Although research has confirmed that there is a strong relationship between school context and teachers' work in

schools, it is difficult to draw concrete conclusions about causal affects. Researchers are just beginning to study teaching within the context of the schools in which teaching takes place, and there is still some confusion about what constitutes the "school as a workplace".

Because schools differ considerably from other organizations we cannot apply knowledge learned from research in other organizations directly to schools without careful thought. We need to understand the uniqueness of schools, not just as organizations, but as places where teachers work. A key element in this line of research is the realization that schools differ considerably from one another.

I have proposed a framework that will help focus attention on the uniqueness of the individual school. Schools differ in physical design, organizational structure and cultural characteristics. In spite of teacher preparation programs and past experience in other schools, teachers must learn to do their work within the particular context of the school in which they are employed.

My initial assumption was that the physical characteristics of schools (e.g., indoor facilities, outdoor facilities, equipment, storage space, office space) would be the most significant workplace factor for

teachers. I thought that issues such as size of the classroom, age and condition of the school building, available space and facilities, and equipment and supplies would be crucial to teachers' work. Although these are important factors for physical education teachers, they are not the only aspects that concern them. Physical characteristics alone cannot describe the school as a workplace.

School organization consists of the formal, explicit, internal design of the school as a bureaucratic organization. This includes the division of work and the assignment of personnel to certain job functions as well as procedures for carrying out required tasks (both educational and maintenance). School organization includes all of the arrangements which make it possible for the staff of a school to act in systematic and coherent ways.

The cultural dimension of the school workplace was the aspect that I found to be the most interesting. For the purpose of this investigation, culture refers to shared ways of communicating, believing, evaluating, and doing that are negotiated and passed from person to person within a group or sub-group. Primarily, it is through this cultural lens that teachers make meaning of their workplace. Through culture, teachers gain the information

they need to form assumptions about their work and about their workplace and from these assumptions, they can then go on to place appropriate values on beliefs and behaviors and begin to act on them in their day-to-day work lives.

Taken together, these three lenses provide a framework for thinking about schools as places where teachers work. Teachers experience these components, not as single parts, but in combination with each other. Teachers teach in schools where all three components are very much a part of their workplace. Teachers teach in buildings that have very specific physical characteristics; the business of teaching is highly organized and bureaucratically administered; and each school constitutes a unique culture that is implicitly communicated to teachers. In order to really understand schools as places where teachers work, however, we must understand them as teachers do.

Chapter 3

METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of how secondary school physical educators perceive their schools as a workplace. More specifically, this investigation examined how secondary school physical education teachers described their work environment, what they chose as significant when asked to talk about their school workplace, and what impact the school context was perceived to have on their teaching.

This chapter describes the methods and procedures that were utilized in the investigation. Included are the trustworthiness measures, selection of participants, methods and procedures of data collection, data analysis, and results from a pilot study.

Selection of Participants

Secondary school physical education teachers were selected from schools consisting of grades 7 through 12. Secondary schools were chosen because of the researcher's interest in secondary physical education. Three schools with departments of physical education consisting of two or more teachers were chosen. These particular schools were chosen because they were geographically located within

reasonable driving distance from the researcher's residence and because all teachers within the physical education departments agreed to participate. Variation in size of schools was a deliberate consideration for selecting (a) a small school with a physical education staff of two, (b) a middle sized school with a physical education staff of four, and (c) a large school with a physical education staff of ten. In each case, the entire physical education department was asked to participate.

These teachers were recruited through personal contact. I made initial contact with the chairperson of the department or, in cases where there was no chairperson, a teacher within the department. This was followed by individual letters to each teacher describing the project in detail and requesting formal consent for participation (Appendix A). At the same time, I requested an initial visit with teachers to answer questions or address concerns they might have and to ask if they would be interested in participating. Either I or the department chairperson contacted the appropriate administrators in the school and school system to obtain official permission to conduct the study.

Methods of Data Collection

Data for the proposed study were collected in the following forms:

1. photographs of the workplace taken by participants;
2. audiotaped explanations of the photographs given to me by the participants (later transcribed);
3. field notes from observations (job shadowing) and informal interviews with physical education teachers at the work-site (later transcribed); and
4. audiotaped final interviews (later transcribed).

Teachers who agreed to participate were asked to sign an informed consent document (Appendix B) at the first meeting. I then left with each teacher a camera, a roll of 35mm film, the shooting script (Appendix C), and an individual time-line form (Appendix D).

Photographs of the Workplace Taken by Participants

Once teachers agreed to participate, they were given a fully automatic 35mm camera, a roll of 35mm film, a shooting script and a general timeline. They were asked to take pictures of their school as a workplace. The shooting script gave very general instructions that directed the teachers to take pictures of all things important to them

about their workplace. This method of data collection served two very important purposes for this study. First, it allowed the teachers to choose which aspects of the school workplace were uniquely important to them. As a result, targets for observation and questions for a formal interview were generated from these pictures. With this method, the initial focus on the workplace became teacher-created rather than researcher-created. Second, this method also provided the researcher with pictorial data for subsequent analysis.

Significance of using photography as a form of data collection. One of the primary sources of data in this investigation was the photographs of the school workplaces taken by the participating teachers. Photography is a valuable method of data collection used in many different types of social science research. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) separate the use of photography as a qualitative research method into two main categories.

The first category consists of photographs taken by the researcher. These are usually taken personally by the researcher or by someone else for the researcher's particular purpose. Some social scientists have taken pictures on specific topics or of particular places or

events from which they develop photographic documentaries or essays (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982).

A second category consists of photographs taken by others. Photographs that fall within this category usually pre-exist and are retrieved by the researcher. Examples from this category would include photographs in school yearbooks, personal family photo albums, library and newspaper archives.

The photographs that were used in this study were taken by the teachers and provided a means by which the teachers could think about their school as a workplace prior to being interviewed. Teachers took pictures to capture the images they saw as the realities of their workplace. The teachers were asked to take pictures that depicted their understanding of their school as a workplace.

The worth of photography in qualitative research has been controversial (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982; Becker, 1978) and depends upon one's view of reality and truth (English, 1988). Photographs cannot demonstrate ultimate truth or a single reality because they can be staged to portray any given truth. Photographs can, however, underscore one's perceived reality or portray multiple realities (English, 1988).

The significance of this form of data collection for this particular investigation was twofold. First, the initial interview, which was the first conversation with teachers about their school as a workplace, was based on the pictures that the teachers took. As a result, the investigation began by focusing on what teachers believed were the most salient aspects of their school work environment as opposed to beginning with the researcher's notions of what was important about schools as workplaces. Second, using photography provided an additional source of data that were analyzed first by teachers as they explained their pictures and second by me as I compared pictures taken within departments and then between departments.

Audiotaped explanations of the photographs. Teachers were asked to explain each picture to me. I asked them to provide a brief description and history of their school as they presented what they had taken pictures of and why they chose to take the pictures they did. This session was audiotaped and transcribed. The transcripts were read and used to construct brief profiles of each teacher and more detailed profiles of each school workplace. The profiles and transcripts from this meeting were used to identify topics for direct field observations (job shadowing) and to

develop questions for a final interview with each teacher that took place near the end of the study.

Field Notes From Observations, Job Shadowing and Informal Interviews with Physical Education Teachers at the Work-site

I spent a minimum of three weeks at each work-site observing the teachers in each school represented in the study. During this time I shadowed teachers, watching their interactions with others, how they spent their time, what skills and behaviors their school appeared to demand, and in what ways they appeared to be responding to the unique elements of the school workplace. Field notes were taken to record observations and information from informal interviews.

Audiotaped Final Interviews

A final structured interview with each participant was conducted after observations at their school were finished. The purpose of these conversations was to obtain more detail about the school workplace factors that teachers had identified as being important. The interview also allowed me to ask questions which arose from my observations. All final interviews with teachers were audiotaped and fully transcribed.

Time-lines

Teachers were given approximately two weeks to take their pictures. Once the pictures were taken and the film had been developed, I met with each teacher to view their pictures. The observations began within one week after all teachers within a department had explained their pictures. The final interview with each teacher occurred after all photographic and observational data had been collected and data analysis was well underway.

Exiting

My exit from the field site was followed by letters to the teachers thanking them for their participation in my study and offering to share with them the results of this study at the time of its completion. In addition, time was spent communicating my appreciation to the appropriate administrators for being allowed to conduct research in their school system.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed in the following manner. After the tapes from the initial interviews (in which teachers described their pictures) were transcribed and relevant topics extracted from each teacher's perceptions or their

workplace, detailed profiles were constructed, describing from the teachers' vantagepoint, each school as a work environment. These profiles described the physical, organizational, and cultural aspects of the schools including accounts of how the resident teachers perceived the physical characteristics of their school, how physical education was organized within their school, and how teachers of physical education appeared to exist as a subculture within the wider context of their school.

At the time of the first interview with teachers, I also began to group their recorded responses and comments into broad data categories which accommodated the major regularities within the teachers' perceptions of their workplace (categories) and allowed searches for relationships (themes) among categories and between schools. This process continued throughout the entire study. All data were maintained on computer disks and were continuously updated throughout the study.

Profiles and data categories were used to focus my observations within the individual physical education departments and to develop questions for the final teacher interviews. Finally, themes were created to identify similarities among teachers working in different schools. These comparisons were done to identify differences and

similarities in how individual teachers within the same work environment perceived the school workplace and to identify differences and similarities among teachers working in three different schools. These comparisons allowed inferences about whether or not teaching physical education is the same or different across workplaces.

Establishing Trustworthiness

I stayed in the schools for a period of time that was sufficient with most teachers to develop a level of trust sufficient to sustain conversations about some sensitive issues. In order to establish trustworthiness of methods and procedures for this study peer debriefing, member checking, and triangulation (multiple and different sources of methods) were employed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Peer Debriefing

A peer debriefer was used continuously throughout the study. The peer debriefer had access to the all transcripts. As profiles were constructed the peer debriefer read them to ensure that the findings were grounded in the data. A second peer debriefer observed the sorting process for teachers' photographs and read themes for accuracy.

Triangulation

Multiple data sources allowed me to compare information provided by teachers (under several different circumstances) with my personal observation of their work environment, thus triangulating data related to a variety of workplace factors.

Member Checking

Before exiting each school I sat down with individual teachers and groups of teachers to get their feedback about my interpretations on their perceptions. This provided a final opportunity for clarification of my findings.

Pilot Study

A pilot study of one physical education department with two physical educators (one female and one male) was conducted using the proposed methodology. More specifically, the pilot was designed to test the following:

1. photographs of the workplace taken by participants (the shooting script),
2. audiotaped explanations of the photographs given to me by the participants,
3. on site observations, and
4. format of final interview.

The proposed methodology proved to be both workable and an adequate source of data with which to answer the research questions. Because the methodology was successful at the pilot school, the pilot data were included as the third school case in the overall study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe the school as a workplace from the perspectives of secondary school physical education teachers. The specific research questions that guided this research were

1. How do secondary school physical education teachers describe their work environment and what do they describe as being significant when asked to talk about their workplace?
2. How do secondary physical education teachers perceive the impact, if any, of the school context on their teaching?

To address these questions, four data sources were used: audiotaped explanations of teachers' selected photographs of the workplace, field notes from observations of teachers in their workplace, informal interviews with physical education teachers at the worksite, and audiotaped final formal interviews.

Data were analyzed and profiles of each school were constructed to address research question number one. The profiles describe each school as a work environment as experienced by the individual teachers working in them.

Research question number two was addressed by searching the data for similarities among all teachers perspectives about their school as a workplace. Similarities were grouped into categories and later into themes.

Photographic Data

The use of photography provided two opportunities for data analysis in this study. The first was an analysis of the photographs themselves, i.e., of what did the teachers take pictures? Information concerning teachers' photographs is presented in Table 1 (p. 108). The second opportunity was an analysis of their photographs: what meaning did the pictures have for the individuals who took them? This second form of analysis was derived from transcripts of teachers' explanations of their photographs and is represented in themes derived from the overall analysis of all transcripts accrued in the study.

Teachers' Photographs

A total of 518 usable photographs were taken of three different school work environments. Teachers' comments on the pictures and the subsequent categorization process revealed that the majority of pictures taken fell within the organizational domain while the smallest number of pictures fell within the cultural domain.

Table 1: Summary of Teachers' Photographs

Category	Totals				
Physical	**Number of Pictures**				
	J	**S**	**L**	**Total**	**Percentage**
The School	1	8	7	16	8
Physical Education Environment	15	36	44	95	50
Outside the Physical Education Environment	17	30	24	71	37
Other	2	8	0	10	5
Organizational	**Number of Pictures**				
	J	**S**	**L**	**Total**	**Percentage**
Activities	4	11	92	107	44
Personnel	9	19	50	78	32
Professional Responsibilities	10	5	41	56	23
Other	0	0	2	2	8
Cultural	**Number of Pictures**				
	J	**S**	**L**	**Total**	**Percentage**
Informal Interaction Patterns of People	1	8	7	16	8
Norms for Behavior	2	1	15	18	23
Routines and Rituals	2	1	11	14	18
Values	2	6	32	40	50

Note: J=Jacksonville, S=Springdale, L=Lukie

The photographs categorized within the physical domain strongly reflected the secondary school physical educators' immediate world of work. In spite of strong literature support for teacher isolation in physical education (Griffin, 1986; Schwager, 1986; Tousignant, Brunelle & Morency, 1986), the teachers in this study perceived their workplace as reaching beyond the typical territorial domain of the gymnasium into other places within the school.

Although the majority of pictures within the physical domain represented the gymnasium and all its auxiliary spaces, teachers in this study had a strong orientation toward the entire school and were definitely aware of a wider world outside the gymnasium. This was especially true for teachers in the smallest school who were aware of almost everything that went on within the school. Even teachers in the largest school, however, who literally taught behind locked doors, saw their workplace as encompassing more than the physical boundaries of their self-contained field house.

The photographs categorized within the organizational domain characterized the different dimensions of the job of being a secondary school physical educator. Three categories seemed significant within this domain, ACTIVITIES, PERSONNEL, and PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

More than half of all the pictures within this domain were taken of various activities taught within the different physical education programs (e.g., aerobic fitness, lacrosse, softball, volleyball, weight lifting). In addition to being the most frequently photographed category within the organizational domain, ACTIVITIES was also the most popular overall category. This suggests (photographic data only) that the teachers in this study perceived content, what they taught, as being the most significant part of their job.

Pictures of PERSONNEL that were included within the organizational domain included administrators, colleagues, custodial staff, secretaries and support staff. A large number of teachers' photographs indicated that physical education colleagues were clearly the most significant people in the workplace for these teachers. These were the people with whom these teachers spent the most time, who best understood their work, and who shared the same physical space (offices were shared in two of the three schools).

Administrators also were important to these teachers and represented the second most photographed group of people in the workplace. Those photographed included a superintendent, several principals and assistant

principals, and a district physical education coordinator. Teachers spoke of their administrators as either being supportive or not supportive of their subject area and of student discipline.

With the exception of one classroom teacher, all school personnel photographed and coded within the PERSONNEL category were administrators, physical education colleagues or support staff (e.g., guidance counselors, janitors, librarians, nurses, secretaries, and school psychologists). This indicates that although these teachers saw their workplace as reaching beyond the gymnasium, it did not include significant relationships with teachers in other subject areas. Photographic data suggest that there is very little meaningful contact between these physical educators and other subject area teachers within their schools.

Other people who were pictured as being important to the work lives of these teachers were janitors, school nurses, and secretaries. Although teachers indicated that students were also important to their work lives, pictures of students were sorted into other categories. Most were sorted into the category labeled PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES. In comments about students, teachers indicated that part of their professional responsibility is

to solicit and maintain the voluntary participation of students in class activities (Doyle, 1979). In addition to these pictures of students, there were a substantial number of aggregates of students. These were spoken of in terms such as "this is my tennis class". These were categorized as ACTIVITIES.

Culture was much more difficult to photograph. Nevertheless, the teachers in this study did take pictures that were coded within the cultural domain. These photographs provide clues that help us begin to understand the cultural properties of the specific schools in which these teachers work.

The most popular category within this domain was VALUES, which represented what these teachers believed to be important in the workplace. Examples included teachers' personal time, teachers' social time, and the individual needs of students. A second category represented in this domain was ROUTINES AND RITUALS. This included such commonly occurring behaviors as morning routines (e.g., drinking coffee, chatting in the office before the day began, meeting in the locker room between classes) and rituals (sitting at the same place at the lunch table every day, celebrating one another's birthday by sharing a cake, going out as a group to celebrate the end of each semester).

The photographs (with related comments) categorized in the cultural domain also revealed clues about particular NORMS FOR BEHAVIOR within each school. For example, humor in the workplace was clearly depicted as a norm for behavior at Lukie Memorial, but was not represented at either Springdale or Jacksonville.

A fourth cultural category was INFORMAL INTERACTION PATTERNS OF PEOPLE. This revealed the importance of friendship in the workplace and also defined some of the informal relationships and communication patterns of teachers. Included within this category was time spent informally with colleagues. Secretaries and janitors were identified as being people with whom informal interaction occurred frequently and who were especially helpful in getting information and getting things done quickly and efficiently.

This analysis of the photographs revealed that although these physical educators identified strongly with their content area (sports, games and dance) and with the environment in which they worked (the gymnasium, auxiliary teaching stations, locker room, and personal office space), they had far stronger connections with the rest of the school than previous research may have led us to believe. These teachers identified superiors and colleagues (mostly

physical education colleagues) as being important to their work, they identified a diverse range of professional responsibilities that they felt compelled to carry out, and they believed it to be important to reserve personal time and time for friends within the school day.

In contrast to evidence in the literature pointing to the central importance of teacher/coach role conflict (Bain 1983; Locke & Massengale, 1978) in physical education, very few photographs included pictures of athletes (5) or of teachers' coaching roles (3). Eight teachers in this study were presently coaching and six others had coached at some time in their careers. Although data suggest that these physical educators apparently identified more with responsibilities associated with their teaching and less with coaching responsibilities it may be that they simply considered coaching to be separate from teaching and therefore not significant to this study. Conversations about coaching did occur, however, and were documented within transcripts of informal and formal interviews.

School Profiles

School profiles were constructed using all of the available data compiled from each school (transcripts from field notes, formal and informal interviews, job shadowing

and observations, and the photographic data). The profiles will introduce each school by providing a description of its particular physical, organizational and cultural characteristics and the individual physical education teachers who work there.

The nature of each profile reflects the information obtained from individual teachers during my observation at each site. The profiles are, therefore, not necessarily parallel in construction or content, but reflect the individuality of three different workplaces. To protect their anonymity, pseudonyms have been used for the teachers. (For demographic information about all sixteen teachers in this study, see Table 2, p. 116).

Jacksonville Junior/Senior High School

Jacksonville Junior/Senior High School is a small rural school located in a town of approximately 5100. Jacksonville serves grades six through twelve with a student population of approximately 350.

The school, built in 1987, replaced an old building that was no longer adequate for the number of students and the educational needs of the community. The new building is much larger and more modern and is equipped with many facilities that the old building did not have (e.g.,

Table 2: Demographic Information for all Physical Educators

Name	Age	Gender	Marital Status	Years Teaching	Years in System	Years at Present School	Years Coaching	Presently Coaching in System	Presently Coaching Outside System
Jacksonville									
Emmie	30	F	Single	7	7	7	7	Yes	No
Keegan	29	M	Married	2	2	2	2	Yes	Yes
Springdale									
Carrie	43	F	Divorced	22	22	22	6	No	No
Mary	46	F	Single	23	23	23	22	Yes	No
Greg	46	M	Married	23	23	23	22	Yes	No
Warren	45	M	Married	25	25	25	21	Yes	No
Lukie									
Blanche	45	F	Divorced	20	20	14	0	No	No
Dorothy	39	F	Married	19 1/2	19 1/2	14	0	No	No
Rose	41	F	Single	20	20	16	11	No	No
Sophia	45	F	Single	23	23	23	15	No	No
Alley	49	M	Married	27	29	20	28	No	No
Andy	42	M	Married	20	20	15	12	Yes	No
Amos	42	M	Married	21	21	14	15	No	No
Mack	43	M	Married	19	19	19	6	No	No
Mick	42	M	Married	20	20	14	18	Yes	No
Sam	45	M	Married	22	22	14	12	Yes	No

auditorium, art room, band room, home economics room, industrial arts room, locker rooms, science labs).

The physical educators at Jacksonville. Emmie and Keegan are the two physical educators at Jacksonville. They have considerably fewer years of teaching experience than the other teachers in this study (all others have twenty years or more) and both began their teaching careers after first working briefly in other fields. Emmie worked in retail and Keegan worked for the Young Men's Christian Association. Emmie has been at Jacksonville for seven years while Keegan is finishing his second year and this is the first teaching site for both.

Jacksonville is a small school and both Emmie and Keegan wear many hats. In addition to teaching physical education, they both coach. Emmie coaches soccer and softball at Jacksonville and Keegan coaches baseball at Jacksonville and football for a nearby college. They also teach some health classes, supervise study halls and have administrative duties (e.g., morning cafeteria duty and afternoon dismissal duty). In addition, Emmie has just taken on the additional responsibility of athletic director.

Emmie and Keegan view their role as physical educators very differently. Emmie perceives her role to be that of a

social counselor, available to students when they have problems and need an adult with whom they can talk. She believes that physical education offers an informal environment where students can feel more comfortable talking to a teacher. Her main objective for physical education, therefore, is to get as many students (more specifically girls) to participate in and enjoy physical education classes as possible. In return, Emmie has a chance to get to know students better and to build personal relationships with students so that they feel more comfortable confiding in her when necessary.

Conversely, Keegan's approach is more didactic. He is not as comfortable in the role of social counselor and feels that although that is part of his job, it is not the most important part. He is much more comfortable focusing on instruction.

In spite of their philosophical differences, Emmie and Keegan have negotiated a working relationship that is comfortable for both of them. They prefer to teach most of their classes independently. Keegan teaches mostly male classes while Emmie teaches mostly female classes. They occasionally combine the boys and the girls into one group for large group activities or for convenience when one of them needs to attend to other responsibilities (e.g., when

Emmie has to take care of some of her athletic director obligations).

Physical characteristics. The new school is not only much larger than the building it replaced, but is built on three different levels which gives each floor its own territorial distinction. The first level houses the junior high classrooms and, with the exception of going to physical education and science labs, is where these students spend their school day. The second level is the central part of the school; the main entrance to the building and the school office are located here. In addition, classrooms for the high school students, the cafeteria and the library are all located on the second floor. The gymnasium and auditorium are located on the third level along with the science laboratories and some additional classrooms. There is a teachers' lounge located on each level. The building is constructed on a sloping site and all three levels have entrances from the outside.

The entrance to the third level is designed for the general public to use when attending events held in either the gymnasium or the auditorium. Doors open into a foyer that is decorated with cases of athletic and band trophies. A large hallway connects the foyer to the

auditorium, gymnasium and locker room entrances. The locker rooms are rather small, but are newly painted in bright purples and blues on a white background.

Both teachers have offices located in their respective locker rooms. The offices have windows on three sides facing out into the locker room and a door for privacy. Both offices have a desk, file cabinet, book shelf, telephone and private bathroom with a toilet, shower and sink.

Each locker room has a door that opens out onto the outdoor athletic fields which are located directly behind the school building. These fields are also used by the physical education department as an outdoor teaching space. The indoor teaching stations for the physical educators consist of a large gymnasium and a small weight room that also doubles as one of two storage closets for physical education and athletic equipment. Large furnace pipes and ventilation ducts hang from the ceilings in both the gymnasium and the weight room. The ventilation is not adequate and doors are often opened to allow fresh air to come in.

As is typical for most secondary schools, the gymnasium is designed for high school athletics. The space is filed with a regulation size basketball court with two

hoops at either end and four additional hoops along both sides. The walls are decorated with championship banners won by various school teams and a new scoreboard hangs on the wall over the main entrance. The clock on the wall is covered by a protective cage and there are acoustic soundboards halfway up the wall on two sides of the gym.

The wall opposite the locker room doors is lined with two sections of bleachers that are pushed back tightly against the wall. Lining the walls, on both sides of the gym, are eight long, narrow windows that have shades which are always pulled shut, preventing any natural light from entering.

The gymnasium has a clean appearance. The walls are painted off-white and the floor has a clear finish over hardwood boards. A lion, the school's mascot, has been painted in the center circle of the basketball court and a large American flag hangs on the far wall.

Organizational characteristics. Physical education classes at Jacksonville have priority in the scheduling process. This has not always been true. In the past, students were scheduled into physical education classes after other classes had been scheduled and as a result, students were in classes with students from different grade

levels. The present principal was once a physical educator in the system so he understands the importance of students being in classes with students their own age. He now schedules students into their physical education class first and then into other classes. Each grade level is divided into two sections and they alternate their physical education class with a health class, a science lab, or a study hall, depending on their grade level.

The school day is divided into seven 55-minute classes. Both physical education teachers teach five physical education classes and one health class every day and have one preparation period. Both teachers plan their own classes independently from the curriculum guide which states the philosophy of physical education at Jacksonville and outlines activities that students will engage in while at Jacksonville. Although this curriculum guide exists, it is not used in practice.

Physical education and health are combined to make up a department of health and physical education. A health teacher is the chair of the department but the department operates very informally and Emmie and Keegan are given leeway to make decisions for physical education.

Neither Emmie nor Keegan has experienced much administrative support for their new roles, Emmie as

athletic director and Keegan as a novice teacher. This may be in part because the principal, Bob, is also in a new role and is therefore still learning the ropes as an administrator. Aside from his required evaluations of their teaching, Bob has spent very little time observing Emmie and Keegan in the gym.

Because both Emmie and Keegan coach in addition to their teaching and spend long days at school during their sport seasons, they are not actively involved in the politics of the school system. Emmie does contribute some by volunteering to service a soda machine in which all profits go to the local teachers' association for scholarships.

Cultural characteristics. Jacksonville is a small school serving a rural community. Many of the students attending Jacksonville have parents who also attended school in the same system. A substantial number of students are involved in extracurricular activities such as sports, music, or clubs, while a small handful of teachers participates as advisors and chaperones.

The faculty at Jacksonville varies considerably in age and experience and both junior high and senior high teachers work together in the same building. Teachers tend

to separate themselves into different social groups (e.g., teachers of similar age, junior high teachers, senior high teachers, coaches and men interested in sports, smokers, non-smokers, and those who are together for no reason other than that they happen to have the same preparation or lunch period). Most of these groups are casual and quite fluid, and individual teachers may belong to several social groups.

Most of the informal teacher interaction at Jacksonville takes place in the three designated teachers' rooms before and after school and during lunch and preparation periods. Other common places are in the halls and stairways or outside teachers' classrooms between classes.

Emmie and Keegan's classroom is the gymnasium, but unlike most teachers, they have personal office space. Their offices are secluded by virtue of being located in the boys' and girls' locker rooms. This tends to isolate them not only from the rest of the school, but also from each other. They do knock on each other's locker room door if they have a question or need to talk. If they want to visit with other teachers they must go to the teachers' rooms, but can only do this at certain times during the school day (e.g., before or after school, during a preparation or lunch period).

There is no mentoring system in place for beginning teachers, so Keegan, who was appointed when Bob moved into his role as principal, had to learn the ropes on his own. Although Emmie was available, she had just taken on the new role of athletic director and there was little time for communication with Keegan concerning his job.

Springdale High School

Springdale is a medium sized school located in a suburban area approximately ten miles from a large metropolitan city. The school district serves a community that is steadily growing in population. The present student population at Springdale is approximately 600 students.

The physical educators at Springdale. Two men and two woman make up the physical education and health education staff at Springdale. They are represented in this study by the pseudonyms Greg, Warren, Carrie and Mary. All are in their late forties and have been teaching together at Springdale for over twenty-three years. All but Greg, who served a short while in the military, came to Springdale directly from their college preparatory experience.

In addition to teaching physical education, they are all required to teach health classes and all four have

coached at various times in their careers. Presently, Greg is coaching football, Warren track and Mary basketball. Outside of their school responsibilities, Warren has an independent business of his own and Greg is a general in the Army National Guard. Greg and Warren are both married with children, Carrie is a divorced mother with teenage twins and Mary is single.

Physical characteristics. Springdale High School is a large rectangular-shaped building set back off the main road by a long driveway. Athletic fields line one side of the driveway, and playground equipment belonging to an adjacent elementary school lines the other. A large parking lot that runs the full length of the yellow cement building separates the school from the athletic fields. Small trees line a grass border between the parking lot and the building and an outside courtyard marks the center of the long building.

From the parking lot, the main entrance is identified by a large canopy running from the doors out to the sidewalk where the school buses stop to load and unload students. The main office is located just inside a set of double doors and is visible from the hallway through large glass windows. Behind a tall counter, the secretaries

share a roomy work space and the principal and vice principal have offices connected to this busy hub.

In relation to the main office, the gymnasium is located in the back of the building. The nurse's office, the guidance office and the cafeteria are in close proximity.

The gymnasium is ordinary -- a large square space designed specifically to host home basketball contests. There is a main basketball court in the center and bleachers are pushed tightly back against the side walls. Green gymnastics mats cover the walls directly behind the main baskets and a large mechanical door concealed between the bleachers is available to divide the gym into two separate teaching stations. The walls are painted yellow and eight ceiling windows let in a fair amount of natural light. Fifty-two green and yellow banners honoring various athletic accomplishments cover the walls.

The boys' and girls' locker rooms are located at the near end of the gym. The men share an office in the boys' locker room and the women share an office in the girls' locker room. The offices are small and do not provide adequate space for two people. The men have furnished their office with only one desk that they share. The women, on the other hand, each have their own desk which

provides them with individual work space, but results in a very cramped office.

The locker rooms are relatively small and very dark. Metal baskets and long lockers are set up in rows with benches in between. Except for the fact that the girls' locker room is painted pink while the boys' is painted blue, they are very similar in design. There are, however, two noticeable differences. The boys' locker room has a separate changing room designed specifically for athletic teams whereas the girls' does not. The second difference is that the girls' locker room has individual showers with separate changing stalls for privacy, while the boys' locker room has only a gang shower.

Opposite the entrance from the hallway, the gymnasium has a second set of doors that leads to the back of the school where the softball field is located. This makes it convenient during the spring and fall for getting outside for outdoor activities. Although the softball field is in relatively close proximity to the gymnasium, the tennis courts and the track are on the opposite side of the school and require a significant amount of commuting time.

The teachers' lunch room is located directly across from the gymnasium and all four physical education teachers eat lunch there with their colleagues. In addition to a

convenient place to eat lunch, the location of the lunch room makes it an advantageous place to work during preparation periods. The men, especially, take advantage of the close proximity and do most of their school work on the long tables in the lunch room.

Although the convenience of the lunch room makes it an excellent alternative to the crowded work space in the men's office, the tables and chairs in the teachers' lunch room are unusually small and are difficult to work on. These are, in fact, tables and chairs designed for use in an elementary school classroom and when adult teachers sit down to work or to eat, their knees will not fit comfortably under the table.

Organizational characteristics. There is no department head assigned to health or physical education. The physical education staff is directly responsible to the principal who directs them informally. The present administration is relatively new to Springdale and although the principal theoretically serves as the instructional leader for physical education, he has very little involvement with the department. The little communication he does have usually comes in a top down manner and usually focuses around budget deadlines, curriculum revisions, and teacher evaluations.

Historically, departmental decisions have been made informally by the four teachers who meet whenever they feel it is necessary. Occasionally, directives will come from the principal but, over the years, they have learned to do what is expected with very little administrative direction.

Although these teachers are getting little direction, they are not going unnoticed. The administration keeps a close watch over their planning. Teachers at Springdale are required to keep their plan books current. This is enforced by requiring all teachers to leave their plan books in their mailboxes at the end of each day. Although they are not always checked every day, the administration has access to teachers' plan books daily. In addition to this, teachers must sign in when they arrive at school in the morning and sign out when they leave school in the afternoon. If they wish to leave campus for any reason during the school day, they must also use this procedure.

Although the physical education staff is provided with a great deal of autonomy in their decision making, discussions often occur and decisions are often made for the department by a sub-group. Sometimes Mary and Carrie will talk in their office between classes and later include one or both of the men. More often, Carrie, Mary and Greg will make important decisions for the department while

standing in a locker room doorway between classes. Warren is not always included in these discussions because he is usually not around between classes or during preparation periods when these informal conversations occur. Warren considers himself to be a loner and finds little need to interact personally or professionally with his physical education colleagues. No one, not even Warren, was willing to reveal his routine.

There are no provisions in the teacher contract that limit class size in health and physical education. As a result, classes can range anywhere from four students to thirty-plus. This is becoming an important concern to these teachers because the number of students entering Springdale each year is steadily increasing and as a result, physical education classes are getting larger.

Because there is no system-wide curriculum in place in the Springdale school district, the physical education experience for students at the high school level is independent from their previous experiences. A formal curriculum for high school physical education does exist, but the teachers are free to chose which activities they will offer for a given semester. Because all four teachers worked to develop the initial curriculum and have worked on all subsequent revisions, much of what is presently taught

reflects the current faculty's beliefs and ideas about physical education.

Two teachers, a male and a female, are assigned to teach in the gym at the same time. These two teachers consider themselves a team and the teams have remained constant for most of their careers: Greg teaches with Carrie and Warren teaches with Mary. Students are assigned to one of the two teachers who is ultimately responsible for assigning them their final grade. Each teacher will offer a different activity, usually one team and one lifetime activity, and students can choose through an elective process.

In order to meet state regulations for health education, all four physical education teachers are required to teach one quarter of health. Because health is required for students at all four grade levels, the physical educators simply take their assigned physical education class into the classroom for one quarter of health. In order to take advantage of opportunities to use the outdoor facilities in the spring and fall, health classes are taught during the two winter quarters.

Cultural characteristics. The entire Springdale faculty is similar in characteristics to the physical

education faculty. Even though Springdale is only minutes from a large diverse city, the entire faculty is white. They are also a comparatively mature staff and congregate in small groups with like interests (e.g., smokers, nonsmokers, coffee drinkers, teachers who like to complain). With the exception of lunch time and preparation periods, which are determined by individual schedules, teachers rarely gather together outside of these groups. There was a time when the entire faculty would celebrate holidays and the end of the school year together, but presently that very seldom occurs.

Because of the many years they have worked together, the physical education faculty is relatively close-knit. They do not socialize outside of school, but they have come to know one another very well throughout the years.

Each teacher has his or her own standards for teaching, and each teacher is allowed to teach accordingly. Conversations with teachers revealed that although individuals do not agree with one another's teaching style or even with one another's behavior, there is an attitude that teaching is a very personal and private issue. For example, the women feel that they are more contemporary in terms of understanding students and are more professional in terms of keeping current by attending

professional conferences. Although they would like to see the men become more involved, they have come to believe that they can only be responsible for themselves. A second example is that three teachers (Carrie, Mary, and Greg) all complained that Warren often will leave students unattended and will even leave the school grounds during his preparation periods. Although they do not approve of this, they remain unconfrontational and this behavior continues.

The female physical education teachers tend to spend a lot of time together in their office between classes and before and after school. This gives them frequent opportunities to talk about a variety of topics ranging from professional (e.g., students or their teaching and coaching) to personal (e.g., home-life, current events, politics and movies).

Greg and Warren spend far less time together. Greg does his paper work in the teachers' lunch room and spends his mornings in the main office where he is assigned to help with the attendance procedures.

The physical arrangement of the two separate offices creates a situation where the women are often separated from the men. As a result of this segregation, the two groups act informally as two separate entities creating their own norms for behavior and their own informal

communication system within the boundaries or their office space. Because this department has no formal means for communication (e.g., department meetings), very little information is disseminated among all four individuals.

Because they are together more, and because of their ability to consistently converse about their work, the women usually take it upon themselves to complete departmental paperwork (e.g., budget requests) and as a result they are usually more informed. In addition, because the women attend more professional conferences than the men, they usually are the ones who make suggestions for change. Whenever the women feel that it is necessary for the men to be involved in a discussion they will, one at a time or together, go to the men and include them. They will usually pull Greg into their discussions before they include Warren. This is, in part, because Greg appears to be more interested and, in part, because he is around more. Greg will consistently stick his head inside the girls' locker room door to include himself in the current conversations.

Because it is more convenient, the physical educators park in the back of the building and enter the school through the loading dock entrance. It is very common for them to stop in the morning to talk informally with the

janitors who are usually breaking for coffee at the same time teachers are arriving for the day.

Lukie Memorial High School

Lukie Memorial High School is a large inner city school located in a city of approximately 90,000. Lukie Memorial is the second largest high school in the state and serves a student population of approximately 3500. Lukie is led by an interim principal who is assisted by four vice principals. The present school was built in 1978 to replace an old overcrowded building that had become inadequate for the educational needs of its students.

The physical educators at Lukie Memorial. The physical education staff at Lukie Memorial consists of ten full-time physical educators, six men and four women. All are white and between the ages of 39 and 45 and all ten agreed to participate in this study. Although some of the teachers had taught in other schools within the district, all of the Lukie Memorial High School physical education staff started their teaching careers in the Lukie system and have never taught anywhere else.

When Lukie Memorial first opened, the physical education staff was gender balanced with six men and six

women. The particular demographics of the present staff resulted from budgetary cuts over the years in which younger, less experienced physical educators were let go and more experienced teachers were moved around the system to fill vacated positions.

The four female physical educators picked their pseudonyms together as a group. Their chosen names are Blanche, Dorothy, Rose and Sophia. Dorothy is the only woman who is presently married and Blanche, who is divorced, is the only woman with a child. Although none of the women are presently coaching, Rose and Sophia have both coached for over half of their careers while Blanche and Dorothy have never coached within the system.

The six male participants in this study are Alley, Amos, Andy, Mac, Mick, and Sam. Like the women, all six men have been in the Lukie system for their entire teaching career. All six men have coached athletic teams at Lukie at some point in their career and three, Andy, Mick and Sam are presently coaching. All are married and have children.

Physical characteristics. Lukie Memorial High school is a huge gray cement building that is divided into four separate sections called units. The school building and

all the athletic fields are completely surrounded by a chain-link fence which is locked shut during the school day for security reasons. The main gate remains open but is watched by a security guard.

The physical education department is housed in unit four, the field house. Unlike most high school physical education teaching facilities that basically consist of a basketball court surrounded by bleachers pushed snugly against the walls, Lukie Memorial resembles a facility more likely to be found in a small college or university.

The field house is a large building that is attached to the rest of the school by a long hallway. It appears to be separate in that it has its own entrance from the outside and, with the exception of a few minutes before and after each class period, the doors to the rest of the school remain locked. Between periods the doors are unlocked so that physical education students can enter and exit. The locked doors limit the amount of traffic flowing through the field house during class time and keep out those who do not belong.

The entrance to the field house is on the end farthest away from the main part of the school. Just outside are the faculty and student parking lots. Consequently, both students and faculty who travel to school by car use this

entrance. In addition, the school buses use this entrance as a pick up and drop off point. As a result, there is a heavy traffic flow through the field house before and after school.

When you enter the field house from this outside entrance, you walk into a lobby filled with trophy cases honoring many years of past athletic victories. Straight ahead are two doors that open into an Olympic size swimming pool with bleachers on one side for spectators to observe swim meets.

To the left of the lobby is the main field house. The field house is very bright and very large. The facility is used both for physical education and athletics. At the far end of the field house there is an American flag, a state flag and a school banner hanging on the wall. Huge red banners hanging all around honor various championship teams that have played at Lukie through the years. Two bright yellow curtains divide the field house into three distinct areas. One large area in the middle is the size of two regulation basketball courts side-by-side, and two smaller areas on each end are slightly larger than one regulation basketball court. With the curtains pulled, these areas are used as separate teaching stations by the physical education staff. The two smaller spaces are used as single

teaching stations and the space in the middle is used as two stations for some activities (e.g., conditioning and adaptive physical education classes) and as one larger teaching station for other activities (e.g., basketball, flag football, and lacrosse). Around the perimeter is a four lane track. The entire floor is rubberized. The markings on the floor divide it into four regulation basketball courts side by side, running the full length of the field house. A score board in the center of the field house hangs down from the ceiling and can be read from all four sides. At one end a batting cage is tucked up neatly against the ceiling and can be lowered down for baseball and softball practice.

In addition to the pool and the main field house, there are four additional teaching stations in and around the field house. One, the well equipped and spacious weightroom, is a converted classroom located just outside the field house in the main part of the school. It has two chalk boards on one wall and a bulletin board on another and has a generous supply of exercise equipment.

Another room in the field house is a small utility gymnasium used as a combination gymnastics room and a Project Adventure room. This room, like the rest of the field house, has a high ceiling and has been equipped with an indoor high elements rope course.

A third space is a small room about the size of a typical high school classroom with gymnastic mats attached to all four walls. It is used by the wrestling team as a practice room during wrestling season. The physical education department uses it during the school day as a place for all students who are not participating in classes. It has about twenty chairs all facing away from the doorway. Students who are assigned to a physical education class, but who are not participating, must spend the entire class time supervised in this room. It is officially called the "nonparticipation room" but the teachers affectionately refer to it as "the zoo".

A fourth teaching station, the fitness room, is a small room upstairs just outside the girls' locker room. It is about the size of a regular classroom, is carpeted and has mirrors running the entire length of two walls. The fitness room is used for a variety of different aerobic units (e.g., aerobic dance, aerobic exercise, and step aerobics).

All ten teachers have office space located in the locker rooms. The six men share two adjoining offices in the boys' locker room which is located on the ground floor of the field house. The four women share one office in the girls' locker room which is located upstairs directly above

the boys' locker room. Each teacher has personal space of their own in one of the offices. Their personal space consists of either a desk or a counter top and an individual locker located in a bathroom which adjoins each office. Each bathroom has toilets and showers for the teachers' personal use.

There was a room built on the first floor of the field house originally designed to be a faculty room for the physical education department. Each department in the main school building has a room that is used as a departmental faculty room. The room that was designated to be the physical education department's faculty room is instead used as the athletic director's office. Although the physical education teachers have office space, their offices are located in the locker rooms. As a result, the men and the women are isolated from one another and there is no common space where they can congregate on a regular basis. Consequently, communication between the two groups is limited and when it does occur is quite superficial.

Organizational characteristics. Of the 356 faculty members at Lukie Memorial, 228 are male and 128 are female. Of those holding administrative positions (e.g., department chairs, curriculum directors), sixteen are men and six are women.

There has never been a novice teacher hired to teach physical education at the high school since it opened in 1978. Even then, teachers from the old high school and experienced middle school and elementary school teachers were moved into the new high school when it opened.

There is a district coordinator, Jonathan Myers, who oversees the entire physical education program grades K-12. Jonathan began as a teacher and coach in the system and has been the district director for the past 24 years. In this time he has built a dynasty of which he and all ten physical education teachers at the high school are very proud.

Jonathan was involved in planning the field house when the new high school was built. He fought hard to make sure no corners were cut and he visited the work site regularly during its construction. Jonathan bought quality equipment for his program and made it one of the high school teacher's (Andy) responsibilities to take care of all equipment. In addition, Jonathan hand picked from his entire district staff ten of his best teachers to make up the high school department.

Of the present staff, four always have taught at the high school level. Two men (Sam and Mick) and two women (Rose and Sophia) were staff at the old high school where

physical education was required for sophomores only. The remaining six had been elementary and middle school teachers. With the opening of the new high school facility, physical education became a requirement for all students and hence the department size increased.

Jonathan did not move his office into the new building. He did, however, established himself as the commander in chief and ruled from the administrative building downtown. Although Jonathan solicited the opinions and ideas of his staff, his leadership style was autocratic. He had very specific ideas about how he wanted his K-12 physical education program to run and he expected all his teachers to teach accordingly.

The physical educators at Lukie refer to Jonathan as "THE BOSS". It is quite obvious that the present physical education program at Lukie Memorial is partially a result of Jonathan's interest and autocratic management style. He pushed hard for quality physical education programs throughout the system and lobbied hard for support for his program.

With the help of his staff, Jonathan developed a detailed K-12 curriculum guide that teachers were expected use. It specified what activities each teacher should be teaching, what specific skills should be emphasized and in

what order. It also provided teachers with tests (skills tests and cognitive tests). By the time students pass through the system and reach high school, they are expected to have had the same experiences in physical education, regardless of which elementary or middle school they have attended.

Over the years, Jonathan has communicated his expectation that teachers will adhere to his curriculum. He monitors each school's program and keeps a very close eye on the teachers. As a rule, he visits the high school every day and even though the teachers say he has softened a little over the years, they still seem to take particular caution to "do the right thing" in his presence.

Jonathan's consistent support over the years has given his staff a strong sense of worth. The Lukie system is considered by the teachers to be very political and Jonathan represents the concerns and needs of his staff in the political arena. He is also the key decision maker for the department.

Unlike other departments in the school (e.g., English, history, math), the physical education department does not have a department head to make decisions within the school. Although Jonathan has this role, there are times when decisions need to be made immediately and Jonathan is

not there (e.g., the gym is unexpectedly needed for a school event and a decision needs to be made about what to do with physical education classes). Because professional status is equal among the ten physical education teachers at the high school, none feels comfortable making decisions for the department in Jonathan's absence.

Although Jonathan's programs have experienced some of the recent district-wide budget cuts and his high school staff has been reduced from twelve teachers to ten, his staff believes that they have a physical education program that is better than most, especially for a school of their size.

At the present time, students at Lukie Memorial High School are required to take physical education for two full years, usually during their ninth and tenth grade years. During their eleventh and twelfth grade years they take physical education for half a year. In any given year juniors report to physical education classes during the first half of the school year and seniors the second half.

On the average there are 230 students taking physical education in a given class period. Lukie offers an elective program and all classes are coeducational. In reality, some activities still seem to attract mostly boys (football, lacrosse) and some attract mostly girls (aerobics, fitness, walking).

The school year is divided into approximately eight different units, each unit about four to six weeks long. Four different times a year, a day is set aside for students to choose, from a variety of activities, the classes they would like to take. During these times they choose activities for two units. Not only do the students at Lukie Memorial have many activities to choose from in a given unit (approximately six different choices per unit), but they also can choose among several different teachers. Students choose their activities sometimes because they are interested in the activity, other times because they prefer a particular teacher, or even because they are trying to avoid a teacher.

During any given period, there are six teachers on the floor teaching activities. There is always one teacher assigned to the non-participation room and each teacher gets one preparation period a day. The particular period in which each teacher is assigned their preparation time rotates yearly.

In addition to their classes, the physical educators at Lukie Memorial also have administrative duties. Some of these duties are school duties that other teachers in the school also have (e.g., supervising a home room or a study hall). Others are specific to physical education (e.g.,

supervising the non-participation room, taking care of the equipment, overseeing the medical excuse system). All of these duties are assigned to the physical education teachers not by the high school principal but by Jonathan. The principal communicates with Jonathan about the number of home rooms and study halls he needs covered. Jonathan, in turn, lets the principal know what other duties are required for the physical education program and how many of his teachers are available to cover home rooms and study halls. Jonathan reassigns administrative duties to his teachers each year on a rotating basis.

Because of the large student population at Lukie, it becomes difficult to manage the students. Learning students' names, for example, becomes a huge task for teachers. Each time the specific activity units change, teachers are faced with new students whom they do not yet know. Because they are dealing with such large numbers, the teachers at Lukie Memorial follow very stringent procedures for absences, medical excuses, and non-participation.

Four vice principals assist the principal at Lukie Memorial High School and each is assigned to one of the four classes (e.g., Mr. Simpson is assigned to the senior class, Ms. Hardy to the junior class, Mr. Baldwin to the

sophomore class, and Mr. Spencer to the first year class). When teachers have problems with students, they have to deal with the vice principal who is in charge of the specific student's class.

The most common problem for the physical education teachers is students skipping class. If a ninth grader is suspected of cutting physical education class, for example, his or her name is sent on a form to Mr. Spencer's office. To help simplify the process, forms are color coded orange for freshmen, yellow for sophomores, blue for juniors, and white for seniors.

In addition to students cutting class, the vice principals deal with all types of student discipline. It isn't very often, however, that a student is sent from a physical education class to a vice principal's office for disciplinary reasons. The physical education staff prefers to handle their own discipline problems in the field house and are available to help one another when necessary. Because teachers have to deal with four different vice principals, four different office staffs, and in reality four different procedures for handling discipline issues, it is more efficient to handle things themselves. This way, problems are resolved and they do not have to wait while an issue gets caught up in paper work in one of the vice principals' offices.

Cultural characteristics. The student population at Lukie Memorial High School reflects that of most inner city schools. Although it is predominantly white, a large percentage of the student body is Portuguese and there are about 1000 out of the approximately 3500 students whose first language is not English. In addition to the Portuguese population, there is a growing number of Asian students. Fewer African American and Hispanic students attend Lukie.

The teaching staff, however, does not represent this same racial mix. There is only one minority teacher at Lukie Memorial. The faculty at Lukie is a relatively senior staff with the majority having taught for 20 years or more. This high number of experienced teachers is primarily the result of system-wide budget cuts over the years. Due to union regulations, the trend has been to fire younger, less experienced staff and to maintain tenured, more experienced staff. This has resulted in an aging faculty at Lukie.

The faculty as a whole is physically grouped by department. That is, each department has its own set of classrooms, supporting laboratories, and individual faculty rooms. There is no common faculty room for all teachers and although teachers are free to use any faculty room they

choose, most tend to use the closest one which is usually their departmental faculty room. This physical design tends to encourage teachers to congregate before and after school and during lunch and preparation periods only with people who share their same academic discipline. Although there are exceptions, very few teachers mix regularly with teachers who teach subjects different from their own.

The physical education staff spends the majority of their work day within the walls of the field house. One exception is Alley who consistently spends time in a teachers' lounge in the main school. All nine others have friends in the main part of the school, but they rarely will go there. As a result, they get little information from the main part of the school. Most information comes informally from one of the teachers who happens to travel into the main school to use the xerox machine or to buy a school lunch, and it is informally passed from one physical educator to the other. Jonathan also will provide information to the department and is their most consistent source of outside communication.

As a group, the physical education staff functions as a subculture within the larger high school faculty. They are physically separated from other teachers and although some serve on school committees and deal with the vice

principals' offices regularly, they are largely governed by their own set of rules and expectations.

This is in part because of Jonathan's leadership style. As mentioned earlier, Jonathan has held his staff accountable over the years by stating clear guidelines, monitoring his staff regularly and consistently evaluating their work. In return, Jonathan has made his teachers feel that what they are doing is important. He values his staff and represents them in the larger school system politics. In some ways this arrangement protects his teachers and allows them to put all their time and energy into their work. In other ways, this isolates his teachers more and allows them to become culturally separated from the rest of the school.

Over the years, Jonathan's rules and expectations have been adopted by the staff as their own and modified to meet a consensus within the group. Over time, however, the group has become divided into two separate gender-based subcultures within the larger group of ten. This has occurred, in part, because of the physical design of the field house.

Unlike teachers in other departments who have a common meeting place, the physical educators at Lukie do not have a departmental lounge where they can spend time together as

a group. Their office space becomes their place to congregate and because of the location of the offices, the men and women congregate separately. The only consistent time the men and the women have to communicate is "on the floor" as they are going to meet their classes or leaving classes to go back into their locker rooms.

Although all ten members of the present faculty have worked together for approximately twenty years, the four female physical educators have shared an office for all that time and the six men have shared offices equally as long.

Each group publicly shares ideas and values about the workplace that are very similar to the other members in their group and members of each group support one another on issues that affect the department. For example, whenever there is an issue that affects the department, the women and the men spend time between classes discussing the issue in their respective offices. By the time the issue is finally addressed with the entire staff in a department meeting, the men have very often united in their position and the women in theirs. Sometimes the men's group and the women's group agree on an issue and sometimes they do not. On occasions when they do not, the groups tend to become more divided.

The men have, for the most part, a brotherly relationship. Their conversations remain relatively superficial and center around safe topics such as sports, current events, people, school and students. They like to joke and tease one another and especially enjoy teasing other teachers, their student teachers and on occasion, students. They proudly tell stories of all the tricks they have played on different people over the years (e.g., putting fish bait in the hub caps of a student teacher's car on a hot day, getting a student teacher to climb up on the platform of the high elements course and leaving him there for the afternoon).

When the men are together in a group, they seem to compete with one another with their stories and jokes. They have a sense of camaraderie, but keep it light and superficial. Unlike the women, they do not seek one another out for emotional support. They tend to keep all personal things to themselves.

The men's subculture is very closed and works to protect their time together. On several occasions during lunch time, I observed students who would come to the door to ask a question and be forced to stand there until one of the men would finally acknowledge them.

The men will occasionally talk about their teaching, but will do this more privately on an individual basis.

The men are not as inclusive and often will subdivide into smaller groups. For example, some of the men will share more of their personal feelings with one or two individuals in the group, but never with the group as a whole.

Although the men share a strong cohesive social group, when examined more closely, they are not all equally a part of it. Amos tends to enjoy time to himself and spends a great deal of his free time tending to equipment (e.g., organizing equipment for the athletic teams and/or the physical education classes, repairing broken equipment, washing and folding uniforms), which is an administrative duty that he enjoys. Alley operates independently from the rest of the group and does not always communicate with the group. He spends his free time away from the physical education office with teachers from other departments.

This men's culture was, however, open to some other men from outside of the physical education department. Jonathan, the director of physical education and Chuck, the athletic director, were welcomed members of this group. Some other teachers in the school who coached were also included.

The women, on the other hand, share a more intimate relationship with one another. They are much more open and their conversations are usually more personal, centering

around topics such as family, friends, weekend activities, personal finances and their feelings about work and life. They are supportive of one another's personal and professional lives. They talk in depth about issues and many times will begin a discussion in the morning and revisit it throughout the day each time they return together to the office. Although there are different degrees of friendship among the four, they all share a strong bond. They also share a belief that there is sexism within the department and that the men with whom they work are not aware of it. Examples of sexism were not blatant during my observations, but were shared with me through stories the women told about past experiences. These included such things as sexual harassment, unequal pay for equal work in coaching, the assumptions that certain activities were gender-oriented (aerobics for girls and football for boys), exclusion from the old boys' network, less informal interaction with their male boss than the men have, and a general belief that their opinions were not as valued as those of the men.

The women will gather in their office before school and chat casually while they prepare for the day. They spend lunch time together each day in an equipment room in the girls' locker room that they have adopted as their

lunch room. They have moved in a microwave and a refrigerator and have put a long table with chairs in the center of the room. The men and the women never eat lunch together, but instead stay separated in their gender isolated locker rooms.

The women have worked together in this building for over fourteen years and though they have had occasional misunderstandings, they are very close and truly care for one another as individuals. They are serious about their teaching and present themselves as professionals while at the same time they make it a point to have fun by teasing one another, telling jokes and sharing stories. They have formed a strong collegial bond and freely share their thoughts, feelings, and opinions with one another. They carefully make decisions that affect their work as a group and take time to consider one another's opinions.

Rose and Sophia tend to see one another socially, which gives them a bond not shared by the rest of the group. The women do, however, gather together socially on special occasions (e.g., the December holidays and the end of the school year). This is something that they all seem to enjoy.

The women, more than the men, are aware of the differences between the two groups. They believe that they

are treated differently from the men. One major example of this is that they believe they are the last to know any information that comes directly from the physical education director, Jonathan. They also believe they are held to more rigid standards than the men (e.g., on one occasion a female teacher was publicly reprimanded for leaving school and asking another teacher to cover for her, a practice that happens frequently among the men who, the women claim, are never reprimanded). The women believe they are disciplined more frequently for faults that are committed by both the men and the women (e.g., Jonathan calls meetings to scold the entire group when he feels the men are at fault, but deals with the women one-on-one when he feels they are at fault). While all four women discussed these inequities, not one of the men mentioned any awareness of differences between the two groups. When the men were asked directly about this, they unanimously replied that they saw no inequities.

If the intention has been not to discriminate, the particular demographics of this workplace have caused some discrimination to occur. The particular demographics of Lukie Memorial have influenced how relationships with people in power have developed over the years. Because there is no common space for the men and the women to

congregate and because most of the people in power at Lukie are men, the women have not had the same access to information as the men.

In addition, not all the men in the group have had equal access to information within the group. For example, the athletic director often spends mornings in the boys' locker room. During this time, a subgroup of the men gather around to talk with the athletic director while one or two are not included or wish not to be a part of the group. The women of course are never included because of the location of these meetings.

When Jonathan appears he walks through the field house and casually talks to different teachers. Between classes and during lunch time he will go into the boys' locker room and talk informally with the men. Because he is a man and is not allowed in the girls' locker room, Jonathan spends time in the boys' locker room with the men and has been doing so for the past 23 years. As a result, he has developed an informal relationship with the men that he does not have with the women. The implications are that the men receive information before the women or that the women do not receive it at all. Jonathan does make sure the women receive certain information that he believes they need to know, but it is the informal communication from

which the women feel excluded. More times than not, the women feel angry and frustrated with this system and resent it with a passion, while the men do not even seem to be aware that it is happening.

The two groups interact socially as two separate groups. The men's group will go out for beers two or three times a year (usually at the beginning of the year, Christmas break, and the end of the year). The women also go out separately on these occasions. Each group will invite friends but they are usually same-gender friends and no one from the opposite group is ever included.

There is almost an agreement among the entire physical education staff at Lukie that "I'll let you do your job any way that you want to do it, but in return you have to let me do my job the way I want to do it". This is prevalent in the many different teaching styles displayed by these ten teachers. Teachers will cover for one another when necessary and on occasion someone will spend time on some outside project while supervising a class (e.g., coaching or outside job). This is a norm for both the men and the women; nonetheless, when the women are upset with the behavior of a colleague someone will mention it to that colleague. The men, on the other hand, just let it go without comment.

The students often will pick their activity by the teacher who is teaching it rather than by the activity itself. Many of the male physical education teachers refuse to teach any of the classes that are traditionally considered female classes (e.g., aerobics, fitness). In addition, some of the men will discourage boys from taking such classes with subtle jokes and remarks and will discourage girls and low skilled boys from choosing their classes by targeting their classes more for the high skilled student. Conversely, other men will encourage these students to take their classes by creating an atmosphere that welcomes the low skilled student.

For most, the job has become routinized and in some ways boring. All ten have considered leaving teaching or some other professional change. Some have established an outside interest that provides them with extra money and a different routine. The reality is, however, that it is difficult to make a professional change in teaching. The average age of these teachers is forty-six. They are tenured, secure in their jobs, and making top salary in their district. Although all think about doing something else -- none dares to make that move. They have too much experience to move to a different school system, there are very few administrative positions to compete for, and to

start something completely new presents too much personal risk. As a result, many feel trapped yet plan to finish out their careers at Lukie Memorial High School.

Summary

The school profiles provide us with rich descriptions of three different schools as places where teachers work. The profiles were constructed to help answer the first research question proposed in this study: How do secondary school physical education teachers describe their work environment and what do they describe as being significant when asked to talk about their workplace?

School profiles were developed to reflect each school's work environment from the perspective of the teachers who live and work there. Each profile was composed from transcripts contributed by all members of the physical education departments who worked within each school and from field notes from observations and informal interviews. The profiles represent the physical, organizational and cultural characteristics of each school that teachers believed were significant in relation to their work.

Although the profiles represent the job of teaching physical education in secondary schools, they represent

three distinctly different work environments in which the job of teaching physical education occurs. Obvious examples of differences include size of workplace, number of non-teaching responsibilities, extent of administrative support for physical education, number of physical education colleagues, and cultural expectations for teacher behavior.

In addition to the differences highlighted by the profiles, there are also some similarities suggested among the three schools. These commonalities will be represented in the following section in the form of themes which were constructed to help answer the research questions.

Themes

The purpose of this section is to present themes that were identified from the combined data sources. These themes represent commonalities among the sixteen participating teachers' perspectives on their schools as workplaces.

The categories and domains were established to provide a way of understanding schools as places where teachers work. Although each category created usually fell within one of the major domains, these three domains are highly interrelated. Teachers experienced these domains not as

single entities but in combination with each other. Teachers taught in schools where all three components were very much a part of their workplace. It is for this reason that the themes will be presented in terms of their relationship to the aggregated data about school workplace as a whole. Each theme will be linked with whichever of the three domains seems reasonable and teachers' quotes will be presented as evidence from the supporting data. The reader may note that, because there was no attempt to assure that all teachers were represented equally, there is an imbalance of more women's quotes than men's quotes. In every case, the best examples were used.

While some themes may fall clearly within one of the three domains others may be associated with two or even all three domains. The following themes illustrate commonalities of how sixteen secondary school physical educators viewed their work environment: (a) teachers feel ambivalent about the effects of isolation, (b) teachers lack control over significant aspects of their daily work lives, (c) teachers seek rewards for activities other than physical education instruction, (d) teachers feel a vacuum in department leadership: like a boat without a rudder, (e) teachers are influenced more by students than by any other aspect of their workplace, (f) teachers' finite time and

energy are drawn away from instruction toward other responsibilities.

Teachers Feel Ambivalent about the Effects of Isolation

Freedom for these teachers came in the form of isolation. Although the price for this freedom was high, teachers valued the autonomy they believed they received in trade for their tolerance of isolation. Evidence of teacher isolation went beyond physical seclusion and included examples of cultural separation and organizational noninterference as well. Although teachers talked of the many negative ways in which isolation affected them and their programs, it became apparent that teachers enjoyed what they perceived to be a positive side and behaved in ways to protect the the autonomy that they have come to enjoy. The gymnasium provided a haven where teachers could retreat to be free from the watchful eyes of others -- a setting in which their own standards could be applied.

Physical seclusion. A concern that is common within the physical education literature is seclusion or physical isolation, caused in part by the physical location of the gymnasium in relation to the rest of the school. This was true of the gymnasia at both Lukie and Jacksonville and

somewhat true for Springdale. Although the gymnasium at Springdale was located far away from the main office, which prevented regular contact with administrators, its proximity to the teachers' lunch room provided the physical educators with some consistent contact with other teachers, particularly at lunch time, and there teachers almost always ate lunch in the teachers' room.

Being secluded in gymnasia set up a situation where other teachers in the school were generally unaware of the physical educators and their program. As a result, other teachers rarely understood what went on in physical education classes. This also worked in reverse. The physical educators became so engrossed in their own world that they were unaware of other teachers around them. This might be expected in the larger schools, but Emmie's comment suggested that it was also true for teachers working in the smallest school.

> Emmie (Jacksonville): I don't see some teachers because I am hidden in my own little area down here -- we're away from everybody else -- unless I see them in the hall. But to actually speak to them -- I kind of forget that some teachers are around.

Although Keegan spent more time in the teachers' room than Emmie, he too felt separated from his colleagues. Keegan said he could go for days without seeing other teachers. Unless he made the effort to go down to the teachers' room in the morning or at lunch time, he wouldn't see any other adults besides Emmie all day.

The effects of physical isolation appeared to be exacerbated over time. Teachers at Lukie felt that over the years they had become less apt to expend the effort to go into the main part of the school to socialize with other teachers. With the exception of the fall football pool that enticed some teachers to socialize, and certain assignments that required teachers to leave the area (e.g., study halls, home room, medical excuse program), teachers at Lukie felt little need to leave their field house. Dorothy explained:

> Dorothy (Lukie): Unless you have the Med-Ex program that I'm taking care of, that gives me an opportunity to get out and see the nurses or go up to the vice principals' offices and deal with different people -- other than that, you really don't have a need to get out of the area....

What may surprise some readers is that even though teachers in this study were clearly aware of the physical isolation they experienced because of the location of their gymnasia, it was not a major concern for them. Perhaps this was because they had never known it to be different or because isolation provided them with a certain amount of privacy that they interpreted as autonomy. Even though outsiders may see this as "autonomy born of neglect" (Bain, 1983), this freedom from others was valued and protected by these teachers.

Although most felt that it would be nice to interact more with other teachers, they themselves behaved in ways that decreased, rather than increased their interaction with others. These teachers clearly liked being separated and away from the watchful eye of the rest of the school. As a result, they spent most of their non-teaching time in their office or in the gymnasium. Mick's comment illustrated an attitude that was held by most teachers in this study:

> Mick (Lukie): I think we are fortunate down here where we are physically by ourselves. I think we're away from the mainstream. We have unique problems but we don't have to deal with a lot of problems they have to upstairs.

A second way in which teachers were secluded was created by the location of teachers' personal office space and the need to supervise students in locker rooms between classes. This kind of isolation, also a result of the physical design of the school, has not received specific attention in the physical education literature.

Every teacher in this study had or shared an office located inside a locker room. In no case did any of the offices have an entrance off the gymnasium that was easily accessible to both men and women. This physical design made personal office space off-limits to students and colleagues of the opposite gender.

Location of offices magnified the issue of isolation for these teachers. Although the secondary school physical educators in this study had other physical education colleagues with whom they worked, the location of offices separated the men from the women during most of their non-teaching time. Most teachers used their offices exclusively for paperwork, planning, socializing, and personal quiet time. As a result, schoolday times most conducive to these activities (e.g., before and after school, preparation periods, and between classes) were often spent either alone (in the case of the two teachers at Jacksonville -- one male and one female), or together

with office mates of the same gender (and therefore apart from colleagues of the opposite gender).

While thirteen of the sixteen teachers in this study spent most of their non-teaching time in their offices, three exceptions were Greg and Warren (Springdale) and Alley (Lukie). Because of the cramped quarters of his office, Greg would often work in the teachers' lunch room whenever he had paperwork or work for which he needed space to spread things out on a table. Occasionally, he would knock on the girls' locker room door to check in with the women on his way to or from the teachers' lunch room which gave him some, although limited, contact with his female colleagues.

Warren (Springdale) and Alley (Lukie) spent a significant amount of time away from the gym daily, although not because these teachers sought companionship with other teachers in the school. Alley disclosed that he was a loner and didn't feel that he was included as part of the men's group. As a result, he said that he left to get away and to be alone. Warren on the other hand, did not disclose where he spent most of his time away from the gymnasium area, nor was I able to observe, nor did his colleagues reveal this information.

With the exception of the above mentioned three, the majority of the teachers enjoyed their offices during their

free time and felt no need to leave to go elsewhere. Mick's (Lukie) comment explains this:

> I did [go to a common teachers' room in the main school] when I first started teaching here but now usually if you have a free period with one of the other guys down here, you just as soon not go to the other part of the building, not at all. We're all just content down here. During your free period you might be doing a lesson plan or you might be reading the paper, taking a snooze or whatever. There is really no reason to go any place else.

As suggested, the teachers in this study enjoyed spending time in their offices. At Jacksonville, this meant that Emmie and Keegan spent their "office time" alone. In schools where offices were shared, this meant that teachers spent significantly more time with colleagues of the same gender than with colleagues of the opposite gender. Gender segregation was the case at Springdale and Lukie where teachers had been segregated by their office locations, and thus grouped by gender, for over twenty years. This had resulted in strong collegial relationships forming within the same gender groups and far less

significant relationships forming across gender groups. This had serious cultural implications for the physical education departments in this study. Because of the gender grouping caused by physical office space, the privacy allotted by the isolation of that office space, and the amount of time spent in gender-segregated groups, subcultures formed within the departments that illustrated cultural differences between the male and female staff.

Cultural separation. Subcultures were formed within the departments based on gender, each subculture based on significant relationships among its members. All members shared a rich past history over which each group had negotiated its own values and norms for behavior. Because of this division, men and women became culturally separated from one another. Although this was true for both Springdale and Lukie (schools with staffs consisting of two or more men and two or more women), it was more obvious at Lukie because of the size of the physical education staff. For this reason, examples from Lukie will be used to illustrate the concept of cultural isolation.

As indicated above, the six men shared an office in the boys' locker room and the four women shared an office in the girls' locker room. Over the twenty-plus years that

these groups had been separated from one another, they had developed separate group identities. There were clearly two separate subcultures operating at Lukie, a men's subculture and a women's subculture. This was easily observed by an outsider, but was less obvious to the teachers involved. All ten teachers, however, were aware that the men and women differed in their beliefs and attitudes about their work. The women referred to this more frequently than the men.

All ten teachers at Lukie were aware that their two groups did not interact often enough but blamed it on the situation of office space. They all mentioned that their lack of a common meeting space made the problem worse. Furthermore, they all agreed that over their two decades of working together the physical separation had pushed the two groups apart socially and philosophically. Rose's comment, articulated more by the women than the men, represents an understanding held by all.

> Rose [Lukie] I believe in our department, we are very, very much segregated in terms of male and female. Since we think of things differently and we react to things differently, I think it impacts on our overall curriculum, more so than it would in a smaller

> school. In this high school we are very much separated and we act as almost two separate departments at times.

Rose, very much aware of differences between the men and the women, believed this problem was compounded by the fact that the men and the women did not spend time together as a whole department. Rose strongly believed this division affected almost every decision that was made within the department. When decisions needed to be made they were discussed first within the two separate camps and later among the entire group in a department meeting. Rose was convinced that each group valued their own opinions and ideas over those of the other and very often saw things differently, partially because women and men perceived social situations and their roles differently.

> Rose [Lukie]: The women are more concerned with the inter-relationship of people where the men tend to say, this is my job, I'll do it. Any time there is a discussion or debate on policy, it's usually that we perceive things differently. The women tend to see things one way and the men will tend to see things another. There is, [however], a gray area where we will [sometimes] overlap.

As subcultures, the women and men at both Lukie and Springdale felt comfortable within their own groups. They related well to people within their groups and tended to find a great deal of support from people who shared similar beliefs and attitudes about teaching.

As an entire physical education staff, in contrast, these teachers felt isolated from the overall culture of the school. This was caused in part by their lack of interaction with other teachers and in part because of the organizational structure of the schools. Although most of these teachers had formed friendships with other teachers in their schools, the school organization offered little opportunity for interaction among friends and colleagues. Because these physical educators interacted infrequently with teachers of other subjects, they had little opportunity to share information about who they were and what they did or to find out the same details about their colleagues. This may unwittingly have encouraged other teachers to hold particular stereotypes about physical education and contributed to keeping physical education at the margins in these schools. Rose explains how physical education is perceived differently at Lukie than other subject areas:

> Rose [Lukie] This is Brenda [a science teacher]. I [photographed] Brenda because part of physical education at Lukie is the way we are treated or perceived by the rest of the school. Brenda is a very good science teacher. She is recognized as an accomplished person, as somebody who is an educator, yet within our department of physical education, you can have people who achieve or accomplish as much and you will never be put on the same level as a science teacher in this school.

This lack of interaction with other teachers also reduced opportunities for the physical educators to hear from their colleagues their ideas and expectations about physical education or to converse about school-wide concerns such as policy or educational and personnel matters. Once again, this situation allowed the physical educators the freedom to cling to their own beliefs. In spite of their own apparent lack of willingness to lobby for their programs, teachers in this study complained that the other teachers in their schools did not understand them, their work or their programs. Perhaps this was partially a result of the physical educators' not initiating interaction with administrators and other teachers. The comfort these

physical educators cherished in being physically isolated cost them significant benefits of membership within the larger school community which in turn contributed to the marginal status of physical education in these schools.

Organizational noninterference. The marginal status of physical education was organizational as well as cultural. Physical education did not hold the same status within the organizational structure of these schools as other content areas and this intensified the isolation that these physical educators felt.

Organizational noninterference was the biggest price these teachers had to pay for their freedom. This resulted from these physical educators being left out of the formal organizational structure of their schools. Two of the three schools in this study (Springdale and Lukie) did not have department heads assigned to physical education, although all other departments did.

At Lukie, the physical education staff had to count on the district level physical education director (Jonathan), who was sometimes available for high school meetings and sometimes not, to represent their interests in school governance and politics. As a result, they often felt uninformed about school issues. Sam's comments reflect a

feeling held by all physical education teachers at both Lukie and Springdale:

> Sam [Lukie] We have no representation. They had one [department meeting] the other day where they were going over student assessments and things like that. Every department is represented except the phys. ed. department. We're never involved in any of these things. We have no input into any decisions that are made. Jonathan attends some meetings I guess, but they are more on a broader scope. On the individual school decisions that are made here, most times we don't have [a voice].

The teachers at Springdale were in a similar situation. They had been fighting for a department chair position for years and still did not have representation. Because no physical education coordinator or department head was assigned to physical education, the physical educators reported directly to the principal. This had direct implications for teachers' work in terms of the administrative decisions that were made for the department. Unlike Jonathan at Lukie being responsible for such things as budgeting and ordering, the teachers at

Springdale had no one to do these things for them and therefore had to do them themselves.

> Carrie [Springdale] We have assumed that role over the years. It's not even cooperation -- if we don't do it, it just doesn't get done. People told us not to do it. . . . Well, if you don't order equipment then you don't get any equipment, so we just assumed those duties because if we didn't do it, it wouldn't get done.

In the entire time that Mary had been at Springdale there had been three changes in administration. Even though outside accreditation teams had recommended twice that the school assign a department chair for physical education, the district administration had not carried through with that recommendation.

> Mary [Springdale] when they have meetings, department chair meetings, we're never included in that . . . we hear things through the grapevine that transpires that might be something we need to know . . . if there is a problem or if there's something that we need to do like turn in our budget request or do an inventory or

something like that, then the principal would say during an assembly period that the department will meet in the library because he needs this by 2:30.

Although Jacksonville had a department head for physical education in theory, the chairperson was a health teacher and had no experience in physical education. In practice, he let the two physical educators govern themselves, and Emmie and Keegan made all major decisions for physical education. In addition, the chairperson did no supervision of Emmie and Keegan's teaching in the gym and was not a school-wide advocate for physical education.

Summary

Being isolated, separated from the mainstream of the school, was experienced in various degrees by all sixteen teachers in this study. The particular architectural design of many schools puts the gymnasia physically apart from the mainstream of the school. In addition to gymnasia being located in the peripheries of school buildings, secondary school physical education teachers' offices are cloistered in gender segregated locker rooms. By virtue of architectural design, schools are constructed so their physical education programs are virtually hidden from other

teachers, administrators and visitors. In addition, the combination of architectural design and specific job requirements such as supervising locker rooms further encourages isolation of physical education teachers.

Although physical design created situations of isolation of which all sixteen teachers were aware, this study revealed other examples of isolation that were much more deliberate. The physical educators in this study were not only physically out of view, they were also organizationally excluded. Physical education teachers in two schools taught in workplaces that did not provide them with a department chairperson to represent them within the political arena. This excluded the physical education staffs from information given to chairs from other departments and gave them no means for formal communication with the administration or with teachers in other departments. This organizational isolation was a result of deliberate decisions made by administrators not to include physical educators in the very basic organizational structure of the workplace.

On the other hand, the combination of physical and organizational isolation gave these physical educators a feeling of privacy and freedom which they have come to enjoy. It has set them apart from other teachers and they

have come to define their own subcultures or norms for teaching in their schools. In the two schools where time was spent in gender-segregated groups, subcultures within the physical education culture developed, which made it even more comfortable to remain isolated and feel safe.

The school work environment separated physical educators by gender and did not encourage them to address their gender differences. By virtue of their comfort with the situation, these teachers deprived themselves of opportunities to be more active in school affairs, to cross traditional gender lines and to promote their physical education programs.

Teachers Lack Control Over Significant Aspects of their Daily Work Lives

This study revealed that teachers had very little control over some of the most crucial and intimate aspects of their work and their workplace. The organizational structure of these schools allowed very little teacher input into decisions made about scheduling their work or the physical conditions of their workplace. In many ways, the job of teaching became very routinized and mechanical. Teachers were literally plugged into schedules determined by administrators who gave little thought to the specific

needs of physical education and when teachers concerns about the physical conditions of their work environment, they were ignored. Although this theme was primarily a result of the organizational structure of schools it also revealed some cultural implications.

No input into their own personal schedules. Unlike many professionals (e.g., doctors, dentists, counselors, and lawyers) who have some say in their daily work schedules, teachers' schedules were determined by someone else. The organizational structure of schools determined when teachers began their day, when they could end their day, what classes they taught, in what order they met their classes, when they had free time and when they had planning time. These important decisions made on behalf of teachers at the organizational level created a workplace that provided teachers with strict routines, but very little individual flexibility.

Depending on an individual's personal preference, a particular schedule might be viewed as desirable or undesirable. Imposed daily schedules were sometimes inconvenient or even annoying for teachers. Mick, for example, was scheduled to teach his physical education classes in the pool and his health classes in the

classroom. Because his pool classes were not scheduled together back-to-back, he had to change his clothes several times during the day.

> Mick [Lukie] So like four classes a day I'm in the pool. It's kind of a hassle because you're in the pool, getting out of the pool for the next class and going back in the pool. I'll end up bringing 3 or 4 bathing suits. Nothing like putting on a cold, wet bathing suit.

In schools that had rotating schedules, a teacher's daily routine varied considerably. Variety in a teacher's schedule helped alleviate boredom, but also made some days less enjoyable than others. Rose explained this:

> Rose [Lukie] Psychologically, when you go to work...one day to the next can be very different based on the schedule and what you anticipate in the course of a day...in terms of how your classes run, when your prep periods are, and also what the make-up of a certain class may be in terms of the individuals you are going to get.

Although primarily a direct result of the organizational structure of the schools, scheduling had some cultural implications as well. Not only did teachers' schedules account for every minute of their time, but schedules also influenced the informal contact they had with others. Teachers shared preparation periods and lunch times (in schools that had more than one lunch period) with others who had similar teaching schedules. As a result, teachers formed friendships or informal collegial relationships with people based solely on the fact that someone else had created similar schedules for them.

I ate lunch with Emmie [Jacksonville] on several occasions. She ate her lunch in a different teachers' room than her colleague, Keegan. Emmie chose to eat in the nonsmoking lunch room because the smoke offended her. As a result of this decision, Emmie consistently ate lunch with a small group of female teachers who shared the same lunch period and also chose to eat in the nonsmoking lunch room. During my observations, this group seemed to be very comfortable with one another and talked freely on a variety of topics. Although it appeared that these women were very good friends, Emmie admitted that outside of their daily lunches, she rarely saw any of these teachers.

A second example of teachers having no control over their schedules involved the frequent interruptions because

the gymnasium was needed for some other function. Although teachers' schedules provided them with a daily routine, it was never a surprise to find that on any given day their schedules had been changed to accommodate some school event (e.g., achievement testing, assemblies or class pictures). Mary's situation illustrated this point.

Mary had been training her health students to teach basic health concepts to the elementary school students. As part of this project, Mary scheduled certain days for her classes to visit elementary schools. This was done during the high school's scheduled activity periods so that students would not have any conflicts with other classes.

> Mary [Springdale] I usually try to check the school year calendar that they put up and write in different things. I'll go down [to the main office] and say, OK, we're going to have activity periods on this and that date and they'll say yes -- but something will happen and that will change. So at the last minute you have to change with it.

This problem existed for teachers in all three schools. During my observations I arrived at Lukie one day to find that all morning physical education classes had

been cancelled. Instead, physical education students had a study hall in half the gym while the other half was used by the yearbook staff for senior class pictures. The physical education teachers at Lukie had not known about this the day before. Teachers indicated that had they known about this in advance, they could have made other arrangements for their classes. I also observed unexpected schedule changes at both Springdale and Lukie for graduation preparation and school testing.

No input into scheduling students into their physical education classes. Most of the teachers in this study believed that the particular needs of physical education were not taken into consideration by whomever scheduled students into physical education classes. Indeed, with the exception of the teachers at Jacksonville, these teachers believed strongly that scheduling for physical education was the last priority in their school. They believed that students were scheduled into all their other classes first and then into whatever physical education class would accommodate the rest of their schedule. Warren [Springdale] expressed it this way, "we've been last on the totem pole [forever] as far as scheduling goes."

This lack of consideration resulted in classes containing students whose skill levels were extremely

diverse, in classes that differed greatly in size, and in classes where the ratio of girls to boys varied widely. Even Emmie and Keegan at Jacksonville, whose principal was once a physical educator, had problems with classes differing significantly in size. Keegan took a picture of one of his sophomore classes that had only three students scheduled into it. Alley said that because of the rotating schedule at Lukie, it is common to have more kids in class on one day than on another. As a result, some classes are very large and others are quite small in comparison. Mary gave an example of the ratio of boys to girls problem experienced at Springdale:

> Mary [Springdale] - there are a lot of girls in this class. Some classes they just load strangely. Supposedly, they try to load them pretty evenly, girls and boys, but there are some periods that there are a lot of girls and hardly any guys and then there are other periods where it's just the opposite.

No provisions for input into the evaluation of the physical condition of their work space. Teachers in this study identified the physical condition of their school, and physical education facilities in particular, as being

important to them, yet in all three schools teachers complained about the maintenance and cleanliness of their physical surroundings yet there was nothing done to improve conditions. Although teachers experienced this as part of their physical domain, there was no formal organizational structure in place for teachers to improve what they perceived to be the poor physical conditions of their workplace. As a result, teachers felt that they had little control over the physical appearance and cleanliness of their work environment.

At Jacksonville, the custodial staff had been cut back due to budget cuts so they were unable to clean the locker rooms adequately during the day and directly after school. As a result, Keegan believed it was his responsibility to keep the place picked up.

At Springdale it was the women who complained about the cleanliness of their facility. When a new custodian replaced a very fastidious one, Carrie and Mary felt that she wasn't doing her job. They had complained to the appropriate supervisor but had not seen any change as a result. Consequently, they had to work in an environment that was dirty beyond comfort. Mary explained the situation:

> Mary [Springdale]: This place is filthy. That bathroom is worse than most gas station bathrooms. I don't even like to wear clothes that I care that much about around here because, honest to God, you get filthy. If you touch anything, forget it. If you have any place to go after school, you need a second to change your clothes.

At Lukie the field house had always been well maintained. As a result, it appeared to be newer and much nicer than the rest of the school. This is because Jonathan, the physical education coordinator, has always demanded this. He kept a close watch on the facility and made sure the custodial staff was alerted whenever things fell below his standards. He even required his staff to maintain the locker rooms between classes by keeping the floors free from debris and making sure all lockers were closed and the aisles looked neat. While the rest of the school was dirty and falling apart, the field house remained in good condition. The physical educators at Lukie felt good about this and were often complemented on how the field house looked.

On the other hand, they were disgusted with the physical condition of the rest of the school and often

complained about how awful it was that the administration was letting the "school fall down around us". Amos was particularly frustrated with the present condition of Lukie Memorial, so he took a picture of the school sign on the outside of the building. Half the letters in the school name were missing and it was impossible to figure out what it had read. He claimed that less and less money was being spent on maintenance and as a result the school was beginning to look terrible.

> Amos [Lukie]: We live in a pig stye. The carpets are filthy. The windows are antiquated. The roof leaks. They've gone from a pail in one classroom [to collect the water when it rains] to a 5-gallon pail -- now they have a 32-gallon bucket.

Although the physical condition of the workplace was important to the teachers in all three schools, short of cleaning and making repairs themselves, they believed they could do little to improve conditions.

Summary

Individual teachers in this study believed they had little to no input into many of the major decisions made

about organizational policies such as scheduling or about the physical conditions of their workplaces. There were no provisions in the organizational structure of these schools to allow teacher input into their own schedules or input into how students were grouped for physical education classes. As a result, teachers' daily routines and their social interactions were dictated by their assigned schedules. Teachers were plugged into schedules that, whether they liked it or not, dictated when they would teach, whom they would teach, when they could plan, and when they had free time.

Teachers' friendships and interpersonal relationships were influenced by schedules that dictated which other teachers were available at the same times for social interactions. This had great cultural implications for teachers in terms of whom they had opportunities to talk with and what topics of conversation were most likely to occur.

Students were scheduled into physical education classes with little consideration given to the needs of the physical educators. As a result, classes varied significantly in size, gender and skill level.

Clean and neat surroundings were important to teachers' pride and teachers complained of either equipment

or facilities as being dirty or in ill repair. Because strong union rules existed protecting the workloads of the custodial staff, they felt they had little influence over such matters. Where they could, these teachers picked up and maintained their immediate work environment (e.g., office space and locker rooms). In many cases, however, poor maintenance or lack of repairs had caused the physical condition of hallways, classrooms, locker rooms and equipment to become unpleasant and annoying.

Teachers Seek Rewards for Activities other than Physical Education Instruction

The third theme represents the positive rewards and stimuli anticipated and received by individual teachers as a result of working in schools. Rewards can be both intrinsic and extrinsic. The workplace provided individual teachers with both organizational and cultural rewards for their work as teachers. Organizational rewards were formal, negotiated between teachers and administrators, and outlined explicitly within the organizational policies of the schools. Examples of organizational rewards mentioned by these teachers were salaries, raises in the form of step increments, enjoyable non-teaching responsibilities such as coaching, and frequent vacations. Cultural rewards were

implicit and less conscientiously negotiated among teachers as being valuable. Examples of cultural rewards for these teachers included meaningful relationships with people in the workplace (administrators, colleagues, staff, and students), prestige, and working in a subject area of interest.

Teachers in this study unanimously believed that there were no positive organizational or cultural rewards within their schools to reward good teaching. On the other hand, it was obvious that all these teachers enjoyed many aspects of their work and that the workplace did provide many rewards valued by individual teachers for activities other than direct instruction. As a result, individual teachers were left to define for themselves those aspects of their work that were rewarding. Unfortunately, in most cases, teachers found reward in areas other than their teaching.

No rewards for good teaching. The phrase "good teaching" was used by teachers in this study to mean excellent instruction tied to students' achieving clear goals. As mentioned above, these teachers believed that although good teaching was expected of them, it was not rewarded within the organizational structure of their schools. That is, the workplace did not support, by means

of formal rewards, the very task that these teachers were hired to do -- teach. This sent a very disturbing message which almost all teachers in this study indicated they had received in one way or another. The message was clear that in the end it was not good teaching that would be rewarded, but rather the number of years of experience that one had that would determine merit and personnel decisions.

At Lukie, where budget cuts had threatened to reduce staff throughout the whole school including the physical education faculty, decisions about whom to cut always focused little on teachers' abilities to teach and always on teachers' seniority. Teachers had been shown over and over again that there were no provisions within the organizational structure which rewarded their efforts as teachers. This created a work environment in which teachers were hired for a particular purpose (to teach) yet not rewarded for attaining that purpose. Sophia and Carrie articulated their concerns about this issue at Lukie and Springdale.

> Sophia [Lukie] In the business sector job performance gets rewarded. In the teaching profession good, bad, ugly -- it doesn't matter. We are all treated the same. There is no area for advancement for good job performance.

> Carrie [Springdale] In teaching, no one says you did a good job. You're an actress or an actor for six periods a day, you leave and no one says, "That was a tough class, you did a nice job with that. This kid is rough, you handled him beautifully." There are no specific praises.

For all teachers, this failure of the organization to provide rewards for what they were specifically trained and hired to do created a culture in which teachers' merit as instructors was predicated on each individual's professional integrity. Sophia explains that because the workplace gives little value to physical education or to good teaching, the quality of one's work becomes a purely personal matter.

> Sophia [Lukie]: If you have two people, one who gives 100% and one who doesn't, doesn't that really go back to what that person is made of? Like their inner fabric. In other words, if I come in and just stand, don't show up for class, just roll out the ball all the time, I would not be happy. I may not be happy in my job, but if I don't do my job, that creates a lot of stress too.

Not only were teachers not formally rewarded for good teaching in these schools, but they believed that there were few organizational or cultural expectations for actual instruction to occur in their physical education classes. With the exception of Jonathan, the district coordinator of physical education for the Lukie district, who provided his teachers with some clear expectations for teaching physical education, the other teachers received little formal guidance from their administrators. Even the format of the required classroom evaluations by administrators was unknown to these teachers.

Teachers at Jacksonville and Springdale were especially confused about the criteria on which they were evaluated. Keegan expressed his confusion about his principal's expectations of him as a physical education teacher. Keegan explained that there were no set criteria in place for what was expected of him as a teacher and he was not clear about what he was being evaluated on during his evaluations. Bob (Keegan's principal) came in and took anecdotal notes based on what he saw. Keegan did not know what Bob expected until he later sat down with him to go over the results. Keegan had only his past experiences with the evaluation process as his knowledge of what Bob used for criteria.

Although the principal at Springdale uses a standard form to evaluate his physical education teachers, Carrie's comment indicates that little of the principal's attention focused on instruction.

> Carrie [Springdale]: You are supposed to hand the principal or vice principal your plan book and your mark book. . . . It's a standard [evaluation] form and they'll say -- you were well dressed, you had a pleasing voice or students were intent with what you were doing or students seemed genuinely interested in what you [did]. You motivate them well -- they look at you for how you handle the classroom, what's protocol. How do you handle all that stuff that's going on.

With few organizational rewards for good teaching and evaluation procedures that were vague, these teachers had little external incentive to increase fitness scores or improve motor skills among their students. Not only did physical educators receive this message formally through the organizational structures of their schools, but the cultural norm among these physical educators held that teaching physical education was difficult and getting high

school students to participate was really all that could be realistically expected. This was most obviously reflected in grading procedures that rewarded only participation, but was also seen in teachers encouraging students to participate and in classes that emphasized game play. The overall workplace culture seemed to support this norm for physical education in that there were no other schoolwide cultural norms that challenged this one.

This does not imply that these physical educators were content with this situation. As a matter of fact, it was a frustrating aspect of their work. Teachers indicated that they wanted to teach and that they enjoyed teaching (which was in part why many of them enjoyed coaching) but they believed that it was nearly impossible to teach physical education to high school students. As a result many felt devalued as teachers. Keegan spoke for most when he said,

> Keegan [Jacksonville] This is not what I expected. This isn't what I wanted it to be. Even though I try to make changes, those changes are not easily made. I just feel like I'm going through the motions. Anybody could be doing my job.

If secondary school physical educators feel devalued and unable to do the teaching which they were hired to do,

what keeps them in schools? Since fourteen of the sixteen teachers in this study had been teaching within the same work environment for over twenty years, they were able to provide some clues about where their rewards and job satisfactions did originate.

The rewards for teaching: Why teachers continue to teach. Although these teachers did not receive formal organizational rewards for good teaching, the workplace did provide cultural rewards that teachers experienced intrinsically. Value for these rewards was determined both personally and within the informal culture of the school. While teachers said they liked teaching concepts and motor skills to students, they believed they had little opportunity to do so and therefore sought rewards from their physical education classes in ways other than teaching. As a result of feeling unrewarded for their instructional efforts, teachers compromised in two ways. As alluded to earlier, they changed their expectations for desired outcomes to something more realistic (e.g., student participation instead of improvements in fitness or motor skills) or acted in ways that enhanced their own sense of job satisfaction by focusing their energy on other aspects of their job where they perceived that their efforts would

be rewarded (e.g., coaching, counseling students, teaching health classes).

For the few teachers who did derive a sense of satisfaction from teaching physical education classes, it was only in isolated situations and an unexpected pleasant surprise when it occurred. Mary presently had one class in which she believed she could actually teach and could affect students' learning; not unexpectedly, this became her favorite class.

> Mary [Springdale] That's why I like them so much. You have a chance to be a real teacher in a physical education setting. Wow, these kids are really interested.

With the exception of this one physical education class that Mary really enjoyed, she saw little opportunity to teach in the physical education classes at Springdale. In contrast, Mary found that health classes offered her more of an opportunity to teach and as a result, she put her energies into those.

> Mary [Springdale] I don't think we have a very interesting physical education program here right

> now. If I had to rate this program. I'd rate it pretty mediocre. I know I put a lot of my energy into teaching health. . . . people have a hard time at the high school level really teaching P. E.

Most teachers in this study enjoyed working in schools because they liked being around students. Teachers have many roles. Like Mary, most physical educators focused their energy on the roles in which they felt valued and rewarded. Social interactions with students and teaching skills as a part of their coaching were the two most popular contingencies experienced by these teachers, yet many others existed and each teacher knew the source of their own personal satisfaction. For example, Rose got a great deal of satisfaction from teaching Project Adventure activities because she could work with individuals on their self esteem. Sam got his satisfaction from coaching because he enjoyed working with students who were eager to learn from him. Mick enjoyed teaching his new health classes because they offered him a new challenge after twenty years of teaching physical education. Mack enjoyed joking and interacting personally with his students. Blanche enjoyed classes like fitness walking that allowed her the opportunity to get to know her students on a more

personal level. She thought few classes were small enough to allow students the opportunity to talk openly about themselves.

The sources of teachers' rewards in the workplace affected how teachers directed their energy and how they spent their time. For example, Emmie got her job satisfaction through her counseling and interpersonal relationships with her students and Keegan got his job satisfaction through his coaching. As a result, Emmie provided her students with a recreational type of physical education program which she believed presented frequent opportunities to interact with students. She explained that this made her teaching day much more satisfying and rewarding as she was able to help students in this atmosphere.

Keegan, in turn, surrendered his own personal convictions about the appropriateness of motor skill improvement goals for physical education and adopted a more recreational structure. In exchange, he focused his attention and creative energy more on his coaching where he was able to teach skills and believed he could make a difference in the lives of a small group of boys.

> Keegan [Jacksonville] Out there [coaching], I walk out that door in the afternoons [and] you're just

> pumped up because now you know you have a captive audience. These guys really want to learn. They want to try to take out of you everything they can to make themselves better. In there [teaching], it's different. You might have a group of people who are trying and another group of people who are just sitting there because they have to be there.

All the teachers in this study claimed that they liked teaching, but as suggested above, it was not the actual teaching that these people enjoyed. All teachers were able to find personal gratification by focusing on the part of their school day in which they experienced some degree of reward and satisfaction.

Summary

Physical education has historically been on the fringe in educational institutions (Hendry, 1975). In times of financial difficulties, many schools have either reduced or cut physical education programs from their budgets. Even in good times the norm for secondary school physical educators has been to face large groups of students with a wide range of abilities in a relatively short period of time two or three times per week. This set-up has made it

difficult to teach skills and impossible to reach fitness goals. Thus, teachers have gotten the message that their program is not valued and that they are not really expected to instruct in their classes. As a result, teachers have learned to do what they can, with what they have, in the time they have allotted. Under these conditions it has become difficult to gain a sense of job satisfaction from teaching physical education. For those who continue to teach, many look for rewards and job satisfaction in other areas -- most commonly in their social interactions with students and in coaching after-school sports.

These schools offered little within their formal organizational structure to encourage quality teaching. This was subtly communicated by the organizations through their process of making important personnel decisions. For example, raises and cuts in personnel were based on criteria like the number of years of experience or the number of advanced degrees a teacher had and did not consider a teacher's ability to teach. Administrators gave little attention to teachers' instructional skills -- just as long as their management skills were good (Placek, 1983).

In spite of the fact that there were few organizational contingencies in place to encourage the

physical education teachers to do a good job, those teachers who remained in teaching seemed to do so for several reasons. These teachers focused their energies towards reaping rewards from aspects of their work other than instruction, such as personal and social interactions with students and colleagues, coaching, and being involved in a subject they enjoyed. Teachers' engagement in these more satisfactory aspects of their role became a cultural norm for them and a primary reason to remain in teaching.

Teachers Feel a Vacuum in Department Leadership: Like a Boat without a Rudder

These teachers exposed a lack of leadership for physical education in their schools. Leadership refers to a person or persons assigned to provide physical education teachers with both instructional guidance and a voice in the political arena of the school organization. Teachers referred to leadership as existing within two domains -- a formal organizational leadership and an informal cultural leadership.

Teachers in this study perceived the formal organizational leadership to be important to their work, but felt left out of the organizational structure of their schools. These feelings resulted from the fact that

although department chairs were assigned to all other departments in their schools, departments chairs were not assigned to physical education in two of these three schools. In the one school that did have a department chair, the person assigned to the job was not a physical educator.

With little direct on-site leadership, teachers accepted responsibility for the formal paperwork but were reluctant to take on the more informal instructional leadership. Interestingly, these teachers were quick to point out that among the ranks of teachers -- everyone was equal. Therefore, in the absence of a formal organizational leadership there was no strong cultural leadership to provide direction. For the most part, individual teachers initiated their own guidelines for their teaching.

Little organizational concern for providing a department chairperson for physical education. Most secondary schools organize teachers into departments according to disciplines and assign department chairpersons as leaders. The most immediate school leadership for secondary school teachers is the department chairperson. Research has found, however, that while "academic"

departments are clearly defined (e.g., the English department is comprised of teachers who all teach English), "nonacademic subjects" are less predictable (a department comprised of health and physical education teachers or a career department comprised of business teachers and industrial arts teachers) (Johnson, 1990).

Teachers' status is determined within the workplace in part by departmental membership. Traditionally, departments in the academic subjects have received more prestige, power, and recognition than those in the nonacademic subjects. Along with this has come an unequal distribution of school resources (e.g., equipment, students, personnel) and regard (e.g., consideration in scheduling, class size, instructional leadership). Departments must compete for available school resources (Little, 1993) according to explicit organizational policies and through a bureaucratic line of command.

Many secondary schools assign department heads or chairs to provide direct leadership (organizational and collegial) to teachers, to act as liaisons between teachers and upper administration (principals and superintendents), to communicate teachers' ideas and concerns to the rest of the school and school decisions and policies back to the teachers, and to negotiate for the department's share of

school resources. "An important influence on the department's professional and organizational presence is the leadership stance assumed by the department chair" (Little, 1993, p. 153).

These teachers indicated that the position of department chair was important to their work. Although formal leadership for physical educators among the three schools varied, none had a professional physical educator in the position of department chair. While content-sensitive leaders were assigned to other departments (e.g., English, math, science) physical education was excluded. These teachers were clearly frustrated with the reality of other departments being given department chairs to lead their departments, while they were not given the same professional consideration.

Two of the three schools in this study, Lukie and Springdale, had no department chair position allocated for their physical education departments. Instead of being responsible to a departmental chairperson, physical educators were directly responsible to other school leaders (principals, district physical education coordinators).

Teachers at Springdale were directly accountable to the school principal who had little time to devote to this role. Although Lukie had a district coordinator who

provided some departmental leadership, he was in charge of the entire district's physical education program and had limited daily contact with the Lukie staff and even less involvement within the high school's political arena.

Jacksonville organized a department that consisted of both the health and physical education teachers. The chair of this department (called a curriculum coordinator at Jacksonville) was a health educator. Although health is somewhat related to physical education, this chairperson had no expertise whatsoever in physical education. This severely limited the quality of instructional leadership directly related to physical education.

Nevertheless, the health educator was put in a position of instructional leader and expected to represent the physical educators in the organizational structure of the school. Because Keegan and Emmie both taught a health class at Jacksonville and had no health background, the curriculum coordinator's expertise in health had been a big help to them in planning their health classes. The coordinator also took care of detailed paperwork for budgeting, organized curriculum meetings, and represented both the health (himself) and physical education teachers in school meetings. He allowed Emmie and Keegan to make decisions that directly affected physical education. All

teacher evaluations were done by the principal. There was no mention of inservice programs relating specifically to health or physical education.

Although Jacksonville presently had a leader assigned to the physical education department at the time of this study, Keegan pointed out that one needed no special expertise to hold this position and that the position had been cut out of the school budget for the following school year.

> Keegan [Jacksonville] The reason he's head of the department is because [it is assigned] on a rotating basis...It's not a seniority sort of thing. In most schools, schools that I had seen, it was like the senior member of the department, the person who had the most experience or the most knowledge is the department head and they are the department head until they leave or decide they no longer want to have that responsibility. Next year, there is no curriculum coordinator's position funded.

The decision to leave physical education out of the formal organizational structure of these schools angered these physical educators. They were purposefully excluded

from the formal lines of communication and decision making structure of the school. At Springdale, even though outside accreditation teams had twice suggested that a department chair be assigned to the physical education department, it had not been done.

> Mary [Springdale] It's been the same battle and even when teams from outside the school come in and evaluate...that's the first recommendation they make. It doesn't really affect the school's accreditation, [so they don't deal with it]. It's the [same] old thing. What's the penalty?

A Lukie teacher pointed out a major consequence of not having a department chair that would be true for teachers at any school.

> Sam [Lukie] We have no representation. They had [a department chairs] meeting the other day where they were going over student assessments and things like that. Every department is represented except the phys. ed. department. We're never involved in any of these things. We have no input into any decisions that are made.

As a result of their lack of a departmental chairperson, these physical educators had little instructional leadership and no administrative accountability for instruction.

Teachers unwilling to assume instructional leadership responsibilities. In addition to having no representation in the school's political arena, a second consequence of having no department chair was that teachers had no on-site instructional leadership and were not being held accountable for good instruction. These teachers were reluctant to confront one another even in cases where they felt a colleague was not pulling his or her weight. As a matter of fact, few teachers were willing to offer their advice to teachers whom they felt might benefit from trying a different approach to their teaching. Even at Jacksonville where Keegan came in as a new teacher, Emmie provided no instructional leadership. Keegan was left to figure things out for himself. Keegan reflected upon this experience:

> Keegan [Jacksonville] I think what happened is Emmie and I kind of tip-toed around each other too. She

> didn't want to be coming over here. You know, a little bit where she felt she was a woman and here I am coming in, a new man phys. ed. teacher and Bob is [the principal] downstairs. Do I [Emmie] go over and say, look this is what you should be doing [or] should Bob be coming up and so it was confusing.

These teachers respected one another's right to struggle with their work and develop their own way of doing things. There were, however, teachers who took on more subtle leadership roles among their peers. Although some schools intentionally excluded physical education from the formal organizational structure of their schools, the physical education staff was still expected to do the same work as other departments (e.g., discuss curricular revisions, prepare budget requests, submit departmental reports). In those schools where there was no department chairperson hired to do these jobs, individual teachers took on some of the responsibilities that would normally be assigned to a department chair. Despite this neglect, these teachers still talked about their work and consistently tried to make things better.

At Springdale, Mary took the leadership responsibility for departmental paperwork. She solicited her colleagues

for budget item ideas and did the appropriate paperwork. She was also contacted by the principal when paperwork was late or missing. Mary said that some of her colleagues told her not to bother. They felt that it would only reinforce the administration's belief that physical education did not need a department chairperson in order to function. Although Mary believed that her physical education department did need formal leadership, she also knew that if they wanted equipment -- this work had to be done.

> Mary [Springdale] ...I could have said that's not my job, but then who's going to do it and then we don't get the things that we need. This has been a running battle that we've had for 20 odd years because some members of the department will say, you shouldn't be doing it, don't do it, that's the department head's job. That's right and I agree with it, it is! The department heads are compensated and given extra time to do these things, but on the other hand, administratively, they could care less. We're the ones that have to teach. If we come back in September and we have classes and we have no tennis equipment and no archery equipment because we didn't order anything, who really gets affected by it? We do!

Mary, along with Carrie's support, made most of the decisions for the Springdale physical education department. They regularly attended professional conferences and brought new ideas back to the group. When they wanted to introduce an idea to the rest of the department they would first pull in Greg and later consult Warren. This was all done informally with the women in the lead.

> Carrie [Springdale] We might say to him [Greg] at lunch like, what do you think about this or [that]. He'll voice his ideas and say, "oh, all right, that makes sense". We'll just pull him in in a casual atmosphere or we'll go to his side of the gym and talk but usually it's in a casual atmosphere, there's nothing really formal with any of us.

Like Springdale, Lukie had no department chairperson. Unlike Springdale, however, Lukie had Jonathan (the kindergarten - 12 physical education coordinator) who was responsible for all major decisions and paperwork. Jonathan consulted with his teachers both formally and informally before making any decisions.

The informal leadership at Lukie was less obvious. Although leaders had emerged among the teachers they did not explicitly acknowledge their informal leaders. From observations I concluded, however, that different leaders emerged at given times and that Jonathan seemed rather casually to seek out different individuals for their input.

All ten physical educators on the Lukie staff considered everyone to have equal status within the department. There was no one person to whom they looked to make immediate decisions. In situations when there was time to consult with Jonathan, as district coordinator, this was not a problem. It became very difficult, however, when Jonathan was not available and an immediate decision had to be made. Dorothy gave an example of a scheduling conflict in which the administration scheduled the gymnasium for senior pictures without telling the physical education department. Consequently, when the teachers were ready to begin their first class of the day, a photography company showed up and the gymnasium filled with seniors. There was no one person within the department who could make a decision about what to do with physical education classes for the day.

> Dorothy [Lukie] [The district coordinator] is an excellent administrator but he isn't here so if there

> is a time we need a split second decision, there isn't anyone available and no one will take the responsibility because we're not paid to do that and...besides, who are we to step over the rest of the crowd and say that we're making the decision?

Several teachers at Lukie pointed out that in the absence of leadership, the department had become too fragmented. There was little continuity among teachers and each individual was "doing their own thing". The quality of one's teaching became a subjective matter determined by each individual for themselves. Although teachers were not always satisfied with the quality of their colleagues' work, very little was said.

This attitude of "I'll let you do your thing if you let me do mine" was observed at all three schools. Each teacher had his or her own separate, idiosyncratic standards for teaching. At Jacksonville Emmie and Keegan had very different beliefs about teaching and both taught their classes according to their own beliefs. At both Springdale and Lukie teachers were frustrated with one teacher the rest of the staff had singled out because they believed he was not pulling his weight (and hadn't been for some time). Nothing was said to the colleague or to anyone

in authority about this situation because teachers believed that there was nothing they could do to solve the problem. They felt that they had no control over their colleagues' behavior but suggested that an on-site, full-time leader would have that authority and possibly could have prevented this from happening. The following quote was giving with the request that the particular teacher not be identified in any way.

> Anonymous comment: [We need] somebody to see that if we're not doing our job, they could come in here and say something to us. Realistically, I have no more right to say something to anybody else than they have the right to say something to me. If I'm screwing off or somebody else is screwing off - [The way it is now], everybody can do their own thing...we have no [on-site] supervision.

The teachers in this study admitted that when there was no one around to hold them accountable for their teaching, it became easier to put forth less effort. Several Lukie physical education teachers confessed that when Jonathan was around, teachers paid closer attention to business than when he was not around. Sophia pointed out

that occasionally things would happen that Jonathan would not allow if he saw them. At Jacksonville, Keegan explained that because he had a certain amount of autonomy with his program, he could often take a break from his teaching without causing any problems for anyone else (except of course his students). On game days he could modify his physical education classes so that they did not require him to do a lot of work, which freed his mind to think about his game. Because he could teach his class and think about his games on "game days", he admitted that his teaching was sometimes given less attention than his coaching.

Summary

Given that the physical educators in these three schools varied somewhat on their opinions about leadership, one message was clear: teachers believed that good departmental leadership was important to their ability to do their work, the status and prestige of their department, and to the success of their physical education programs. Yet, teachers in all three schools felt that they lacked the leadership they felt they needed.

Leadership for these teachers came from the principals, vice principals and a district physical

education coordinator and as a result was removed from the immediate realities of their daily work lives. The limited amount of administrative support that teachers in this study received from the workplace, however, was important in terms of how valued they felt about their work and their program. In these schools, physical education was a marginal subject and some of the physical education teachers felt little or no support from their principals. Those who did receive administrative support very seldom received it for good teaching. Instead they were supported for good management and organizational skills, their ability to communicate with students or successful athletic teams.

Teachers are Influenced More by Students than by any other Aspect of their Workplace

These teachers generally viewed students as conscripts and believed that their primary responsibility was to convince students to participate in their physical education classes. As a result, students' abilities, behaviors, and expectations influenced teachers' decisions about what and how they taught. In addition, student characteristics and demographics affected the overall school climate and students' individual needs influenced how teachers spent their time in school.

Students' influence on teachers' work affected both the organizational and cultural domains of the school workplace. Schools are organized To educate students and must therefore coordinate all efforts (students, personnel, programs) toward that end. In a more pragmatic sense, students have a strong influence on how teachers organize their programs and their classes (Powell, Farrar & Cohen, 1985). In addition, student demographics along with their individual and group characteristics have a strong impact on school culture. Ultimately, teachers have both a professional (organizational) and a personal (cultural) relationship with their students.

Students as conscripts. How teachers perceived students and their willingness to participate in physical education classes affected the degree of influence that students had on teachers' decisions. There were differences in how these teachers viewed their students, even among teachers working within the same workplace. Using Handy and Aitken's (1986) three views of students' relationships to schools (workers, clients, or products) and Dreeben's (1970, 1973) view of students as conscripts, the teachers in this study regarded different students and groups of students differently. For example, Emmie saw

herself as a social counselor and as a result looked at her female students as clients in need of her care and guidance. Keegan, on the other hand, had a more conventional view of students. He saw his students as products to be molded into skilled performers. All teachers possessed a variety of views that varied for different individuals and groups of students, depending upon their personal relationship with students.

Professionally, (in terms of carrying out their jobs), one commonality did exist. Regardless of teachers' views of individual students, they considered the general student population as conscripts -- involuntary members of the school organization (Dreeben 1970, 1973) and believed that their primary role was to solicit and maintain students' voluntary participation in physical education classes (Doyle, 1979). With great variation in class size, student ability levels, student interest in physical education, and student willingness to participate in class, this task became all consuming. Student participation became the ultimate goal of physical education programs at the expense of other possibilities (e.g., improvement of overall fitness levels, skill improvement).

Although there were exceptions, students in these high schools did not show up for classes anxious to learn new

skills, participate in activities, or ready to work hard to improve their fitness. Students came to class with their own beliefs and expectations about physical education (e.g., to play games, to have fun, to fool around, to be with friends, to avoid participation) and with a variety of behaviors to express these beliefs. The many different expectations students had for what physical education should be contributed to teachers' beliefs that they had to make classes fun enough to win student participation. They did this by negotiating with students about class expectations. If they could make their classes enjoyable enough so the majority of their students would show up and participate in classes, they believed they were doing a good job. Carrie's comment speaks for most of the teachers in this study who believed they had to win student cooperation as a main part of their jobs.

> Carrie [Springdale] Ultimately, we have the control, but their [students'] input is very important for what kind of cooperation we're going to get. If we're going to get cooperation, we have to tune in to what their input is.

Although all teachers felt this need to accommodate students to some degree, some were more willing than others

to negotiate openly for their participation. Emmie is an example of a teacher who was willing to go to extremes. Emmie consulted with her students on a regular basis and often let them vote on which activity they would participate in on any given day. This was Emmie's way of winning her students' participation in her classes.

These teachers admitted that students influenced many aspects of their work. Observations suggest that students had more influence on these teachers than did any other aspect of the school workplace. Teachers indicated that students affected their decisions about curriculum, the particular activities they felt comfortable teaching, instruction, safety, how they spent their time, and their ability to teach.

Student influence on teachers' decisions about curriculum. Above all else, it was important to Emmie that students participated in her classes. For this reason, Emmie very often gave students choices about activities in the curriculum. Even though students were willing to do only a few sports, Emmie acquiesced in order to gain their participation. It is not clear whether or how Emmie compromised her beliefs about an appropriate secondary physical education curriculum as the trade-off.

> Emmie [Jacksonville] I had one class last year, the only thing they would do was volleyball. I'm not exaggerating at all. I would say three full quarters they played volleyball every class. That was what they changed for, that was what they played, and that was what I let them do. They all played, they got into the games, and I saw improvement.

Due to Emmie's commitment to gaining students' participation, there was very little effort toward developing continuity across activity units of throughout the program. I observed several classes in which Emmie would gather students into a group at the beginning of the class period and give them a choice between two different activities. She would then let them vote as a group on which activity they would like to participate in. Because students were given these choices each class period, there was little carry-over from one class to another and almost no sequencing of activities or skills or continuity throughout the physical education curriculum: it became a patchwork quilt.

Although Keegan was not quite as willing to relinquish all of his decision making power in terms of curriculum, he also negotiated with his students in order to win their

compliance. Keegan was less willing to give his students control over which activities they would participate in on a given day. Keegan believed there were specific activities that should be included within a secondary school physical education curriculum and that he was in charge of scheduling and sequencing these. Although this was his belief, he had come to realize that it could not realistically be his practice. Coming to accept this reality had been very upsetting to Keegan:

> Keegan: [Jacksonville]: It's not what I expected. This isn't what I wanted it to be. Even though I try to make changes, because of the way the structure is of the whole thing, those changes are not easily made. I just feel like I'm going through the motions. Anybody could be doing my job. They could just hire a sub for a lot less money than what they're paying me.

Keegan explained there were times when students would "sabotage" his plans for a particular class by not trying to do their best in specific activities. As a result, Keegan compromised a little to get students to put more effort into classes. He did this by allowing them to spend

a portion of the class time doing something that was important to them (e.g., playing a game of softball) if they agreed to devote time and effort towards something that was important to him (e.g., participating in the President's Physical Fitness Test).

Students influenced the curriculum at Springdale and Lukie as well. Teachers noticed that over the years students have become less interested in physical activity and less willing to participate. Lukie and Springdale teachers' beliefs coincided with Mary's observation that student influence has changed their jobs considerably.

> Mary: [Springdale] I think in the last 10 years it has become a lot more management, a lot more recreational, a lot more of a struggle, for want of a better word. Struggling with kids to get them motivated. Struggling with kids to get them to want to exercise in any way, to want to change their clothes, to want to sweat because they're so into their nails and their hair and makeup and jewelry. It's like a constant battle...and after a while you get sick of the battles so you lessen your standards.

Students' attitudes and expectations for physical education made it necessary for teachers to negotiate with students

for their cooperation and participation in classes. Teachers believed that their biggest bargaining chip was to offer the activities that the students would like. Although negotiations meant that curricular decisions and instructional methods might have to be altered, these teachers believed that this was a necessary concession if they were to obtain a minimum of student cooperation in the gym.

Student perceptions influenced teachers' decisions about activities. Certain activities have become "sex-labeled", i.e., perceived as "boys' activities" and therefore not socially appropriate for girls, or vice versa (Griffin, 1983; 1985). For example, in all three schools, football was a male activity while aerobics was a female activity. At Springdale, Greg was content with the fact that the girls liked volleyball and the boys liked floor hockey while boys and girls both liked softball. Although some activities were more obviously sex-labeled than others, in all three schools teachers knew that certain activities would be avoided by either boys or girls and they made no attempts to educate students to believe otherwise.

Although some activities were actually appropriate for both sexes (archery, basketball, volleyball), and some

students dared to cross over label boundaries, most would not choose an activity that was perceived as socially inappropriate for their sex regardless of how interested they were in the activity. Carrie gave a good example of how students used name calling to communicate the inappropriateness of aerobics for boys.

> Carrie [Springdale] These kids know how to get right to the core of another kid and they'll do it. There's nothing wrong with these Richard Simmons workouts, absolutely nothing wrong with them. They get you to sweat and the first words out of the kids' mouths is, "I'm not doing that with that fag".

Although there were exceptions, female students were more apt to cross the gender lines than males. Dorothy explained that the male students at Lukie "did not take any fitness classes" but she was beginning to see more female students taking weight training classes. She added, however, that even though some girls were willing to try an activity like weight training, she had noticed they were less likely to choose weight training when it was taught by a male teacher. Blanche explained that conversely when a female teacher taught weight training, the male students were less likely to choose it.

> Blanche [Lukie] Weight training is usually all men but when you get a woman teacher in there, a lot of boys won't take the woman, but a lot of the girls will. That's about the only time that they take weight training.

Perhaps a female teaching weight training set an example for girls by providing some sort of affirmation that it was okay for females to lift weights. There were no male teachers teaching fitness or aerobics at Lukie and consequently no boys elected these activities. As a matter of fact, in all three schools it was more common to see the female physical educators teaching classes that would be traditionally labeled "male-appropriate" than to see male teachers teaching classes that would traditionally be labeled "female-appropriate". Both the male and female physical educators taught those activities considered to be "gender-neutral".

Although there is no evidence to determine cause and effect, these data suggest that a relationship exists between teachers' choices for teaching certain activities and students' choices of electing certain activities. This study suggests that the school workplace supports teachers' biases against certain activities based on sex which encourages students to hold similar beliefs.

Students influenced teachers' decisions about instruction. In addition to affecting teachers' decisions about activities and sequencing of classes, students also affected teachers' decisions and beliefs about instruction. The two most common examples were teachers' decisions about how to use class time and teachers' beliefs about the success of co-educational classes.

Although these teachers varied in how they decided to use class time, my observations indicated that teachers spent more class time and more classes devoted to game play than to skill practice. This occurred in spite of the fact that not all students had the ability to apply skills to game situations. Alley observed that in spite of the fact that these students had been exposed to basketball as part of the curriculum every year prior to entering high school, they still had acquired very little skill.

> Alley [Lukie] Everybody thinks of Lukie as a great basketball school, but when it comes to phys. ed., it proved a point that you might have 5 or 10 kids in the school who are great but the other 3,000 have no idea what's going on.

Due to a combination of reasons, student expectations being a vital one, these teachers have come to the

conclusion that classes designed to be recreational in nature (e.g., playing the games or doing the skill as in weight lifting or aerobic exercise) have a better chance at guaranteeing student participation than classes designed to teach and practice skills.

In addition to influencing teachers' choice of a recreational style of instruction, students also influenced teachers' beliefs about their ability to run successful coeducational classes. Teachers in this study believed that coeducational classes were farcical. Teachers got this message overtly through students' comments and subtly by observing the results of students' choices in elective programs. In schools that offered elective programs, (Jacksonville and Lukie) students would often self select into sex-segregated classes or classes that were extremely unbalanced. This resulted when students chose activities based on which particular teacher offered them. It also occurred when students chose the same activity their friends chose or because it was attractive to other students of their same sex. Regardless of why students made the decisions they did, their choices gave teachers the message that students preferred sex-segregated classes.

Many classes which resulted in all male or all female groups were usually taught by a same-sex teacher. Some

teachers preferred same-sex classes and would subtly encourage students to chose their classes based their sex. For example, Sam set standards in his classes that were more easily met by those male students who were highly skilled.

> Sam [Lukie]: Yeah, I tend to get more male students, more athletes. I think I get more students who want to participate, want to be involved. I believe by this stage of the game the way the public school curriculum is set up, they've been doing drills basically since they've been in 5th grade, so there can be some emphasis on drills but you should be able to move past that and not run this like a 5th grade class.

Student choices in elective programs provided these teachers with evidence that their students did not like coeducational classes. This also gave these teachers a rationale for allowing extreme sex imbalances in many activities (e.g., all female aerobics and fitness classes and mostly all male football and lacrosse classes). This was generally accepted by all these teachers because they also preferred to teach sex-segregated classes.

Mary at Springdale remembered how much more pleasant teaching was before Title IX required them to move to coeducational classes.

> Mary [Springdale] The kids would all come down here and we had all the girls, they had all the boys. Seldom did we ever have anything that we did together, occasionally but rarely. I don't know that it was so bad. I don't remember girls being unhappy that they weren't having phys. ed. with the boys. I don't remember any of the boys complaining about it either.

Mick believes that the teachers at Lukie would prefer not to have coeducational classes if they didn't have to:

> Mick [Lukie] Some guys are a little more hard lined as far as when it comes to something like co-ed phys. ed. The girls might feel exactly the same. Some of the guys I think would still rather have all male classes or all female classes.

Although most teachers indicated they still would rather teach single sex classes, the only teachers who overtly did so were at Jacksonville. Emmie and Keegan had

decided to teach their classes separately. Although they sometimes combined their classes, physical education generally occurred as two separate sex-segregated classes. With a staff of only two, with dissimilar beliefs about physical education, and a program that was largely casual and unplanned, Emmie and Keegan had found that teaching independently was much easier. Although a formal curriculum did exist, classes were informal with game playing and participation being far more important than adherence to the written curriculum guidelines. Emmie believed that although their classes did not meet Title IX specifications, their segregated system worked best for students at Jacksonville because they were less willing to participate when classes were combined.

Keegan agreed that under the circumstances teaching coeducational classes was much too difficult. He explained that when given the opportunity, the girls did not like to play when classes were combined and it made everyone's job a lot harder.

> Keegan [Jacksonville] What happens is with just the two of us and the way the program is because we don't have a defined plan, then it makes it hard because we can't say, "well, this unit is going to be going on

> for the next 8 weeks, do you want to participate in that?" I mean, one day we could be doing volleyball and the next day they could be doing basketball. That's just how it goes. It's more a fly-by-the-seat -of-your-pants program. Whatever is going to make everybody happy to make it easier.

Given the choice, Keegan believed he could accomplish more when he worked separately with the boys' classes. Because Emmie shared similar beliefs in this regard and the workplace did not challenge them, there were few coeducational physical education classes at Jacksonville.

Student influence on school climate. Students influenced these teachers' work in ways other than those related to curriculum and instruction. Student culture and student behavior had a significant impact on school climate. Teachers were required as part of their jobs to be disciplinarians. They were to make sure that students acted in appropriate ways not only in their classes, but also in the bathrooms, cafeterias, hallways, locker rooms and anywhere else on school grounds. Teachers in this study indicated that it was getting more and more difficult to discipline students for inappropriate behavior. This

was apparent in all schools, but in the largest school teachers actually feared for their safety.

Some teachers at Lukie admitted that they absolutely refused to get involved when students were fighting because some teachers had been hurt. In addition, teachers had been stalked and physically assaulted by vengeful students for reprimands following inappropriate behavior in school. Two of the physical educators at Lukie had been victims of such assaults. Dorothy was punched in the face by an angry student while trying to break up a fight, and three angry boys went after Alley with a metal pipe after he caught one boy in the locker room when he was supposed to be in class.

Dorothy [Lukie] It's scary because you don't know who or what is coming through that door. It's just a job -- this place is going to function with me or without me and it's not going to be without me. You make those decisions. Anyhow, I'm a lot more laid back than I used to be. I just let a lot of things slide that I normally wouldn't. Self preservation.

Alley [Lukie] I've been to court twice, assault and battery, trying to sue me. It's never been one of my own students, it's somebody else's student.

> Monitoring the corridors, monitoring the locker rooms, I've kind of mellowed a bit. A couple of court appearances. I kind of walk away. You feel like a wimp sometimes.

Experiences like these threaten the safety of teachers in the workplace and definitely had an effect on how willing these teachers were to interrupt students disobeying school rules.

Student influence on how teachers spend their time. Teachers are not only struggling to keep law and order in the schools but they are also being asked to deal with a great number of social problems with origins external to the school. Mary pointed out that students bring with them a host of individual needs that make it very difficult to deal with them collectively as a group. Rose agreed and offered an example.

> Rose [Lukie]...within the concept of teaching at a high school, the social aspect of high school and the students' lives outside as well as inside the school - completely separate of the academics - play such an important role in what they do. Even within our

> program. If a girl is pregnant or a boy has been abused at home, they come into school in the morning. Really -- whether or not they take physical education is of such little consequence in their lives.

As Rose suggested, teachers' interactions with students go far beyond their instructional duties. Teachers indicated that the problems students bring into schools from the outside require a lot of teachers' time. Emmie, for instance, felt that a big part of her job at Jacksonville was to counsel her female students. To her, the informal structure made physical education classes an ideal setting for talking with students. As a result, Emmie organized her classes in ways that allowed her maximum opportunity to talk with students.

Students who refused to participate in physical education classes or who skipped classes all together also required teachers' time. Teachers in all three schools had to spend additional time dealing with students who refused to change for class or supervising the non-participants on the side lines while at the same time dealing with those students participating in class. In addition, teachers had to account for students who were missing from classes. This entailed checking names on the school's daily

attendance list and reporting those students who were suspected of skipping class to the office. A follow-up was also necessary to ensure that no mistakes were made and that students who were skipping received the appropriate consequences.

At all three schools a large portion of the physical educators' time was spent trying to convince students to participate in classes. As referred to earlier, non-participating students distracted both teachers and those students who were participating. At Lukie, an attempt to solve non-participation problems was built into the administrative duties of the teachers. All students who were not changed for class reported to a classroom called the non-participation room. The physical education teachers were assigned to watch these students. This freed all other teachers from this responsibility for the period, allowing them to deal exclusively with those students intending to participate.

Language barriers influence teachers' ability to teach some individuals. Language barriers required teachers to spend more time with some individuals in their classes. Teachers at Lukie were finding more non-English speaking students in their classes. The language barrier offered

yet another challenge to teachers as they tried to teach skills to large groups of students with varying ability levels. Having to teach non-English speaking students was something these teachers were neither trained for nor equipped to do, yet students were assigned to their classes sometimes without teachers even knowing the student couldn't speak English. Rose explained how this happened to her:

> Rose [Lukie]: There is a large percentage [of] bilingual [students here] and that indicates to me some of the barriers we have. I taught almost five weeks in the class before I realized Salvatore really had no idea what I was talking about. He was learning everything by visual analysis. He understood almost nothing of what I was saying. I had no idea he [couldn't speak English].

Summary

Although teachers expected to devote a portion of their school day to non-instructional activities, these teachers believed that they were spending too much time on the non-instructional aspects of their work at the expense of instruction. These teachers believed that counseling

students, encouraging students to come to classes and to change for classes, reporting missing students to the office, and providing extra help for those students with English as a second language were all important aspects of their work. Teachers in this study liked young people and wanting to work with "kids" was the main reason they chose teaching as a career. Although not all of their interactions with students were positive, these teachers said they enjoyed their relationships with students and felt their daily interactions with students were one of the most satisfying aspects of their work. Further conversations, however, revealed that teachers' interactions with students could also be one of the most frustrating aspects of their work.

Students' expectations have forced teachers to redefine their goals for physical education and to feel that they must make classes fun in order to entice students to participate. This same charge is not necessarily imposed on their colleagues in other subject areas (e.g., math, science and English). Students go to their physical education classes with the expectation that classes should be fun -- a release from the academic subjects. The unfortunate thing is that fun and learning in physical education classes are not synonymous in the eyes of

students. Thus, collectively, students have a tremendous influence on specific decisions teachers make about both curriculum and instruction. The bottom line is that teachers are coerced into planning classes in which students will be willing to participate. Sometimes this means giving students choices, negotiating with students for class activities, or providing sex-segregated classes -- in direct violation of the law (Title IX).

Students were more apt to choose activities because of their presumed sex appropriateness, because their friends chose a particular activity, or because they preferred the particular teacher offering the activity -- rather than because they were interested in the activity. Male teachers tended to teach male appropriate activities while female teachers tended to teach female appropriate activities. This bias was consistently observed by their students. As a result, students were attracted to certain activities and turned-off to others, all of which reinforced teachers' beliefs that coeducational classes were not appropriate for high school physical education classes.

Since the passage of Title IX, secondary school physical educators have been under pressure to incorporate coeducational classes into their physical education

programs. Yet over twenty years later, many secondary physical education classes are still sex-segregated. This is in part due to students' reluctance to participate in activities with peers of the opposite sex and in part a result of teachers' preference to teach sex-segregated classes in a workplace that does not challenge either of these beliefs.

Teachers' Finite Time and Energy is Drawn Away from Instruction Toward other Responsibilities

Teachers' non-teaching responsibilities included all duties, in addition to teaching physical education, that teachers were obliged to fulfill. Examples within the organizational domain included administrative duties assigned to every teacher as part of their job (e.g., supervising a home room or cafeteria during lunch time, monitoring a study hall, bathroom or locker room) and additional responsibilities that came as part of a dual role generally held only by physical educators (e.g., teaching physical education and coaching an athletic team, teaching physical education and health). Also included as non-teaching responsibilities were such activities as attending department or faculty meetings or inservice training days.

Examples within the cultural domain were less clear and varied more from school to school. These responsibilities were not explicitly required as part of teachers' jobs (although some of the examples used may be required in some schools as an explicit part of a teacher's job), but were expected as part of the school's culture. Examples included attending school functions (athletic events, band concerts, theater presentations, student functions as chaperones), counseling students, maintaining social control throughout the school, reaching out to parents, attending faculty social events, and community involvement. Unlike the organizational responsibilities that were clearly laid out as part of job descriptions, the cultural responsibilities were communicated as informal, implicit expectations within each school. Some teachers took these on willingly while others avoided them. Still others took them on reluctantly, feeling an obligation but no joy and little personal satisfaction in fulfilling their duties.

The school workplace demanded that teachers fulfill a variety of role functions. This depended partly on the size of the unit (physical), assigned administrative duties (organizational), the school tradition for sharing responsibilities (cultural), and being in physical

education which has traditionally been linked with teaching health and coaching (cultural).

Multiple role demands. While some physical educators in this study were required by their schools to fill multiple roles others chose to do so. Regardless of whether these additional responsibilities were required or voluntary, they required teachers to expend energies in many different directions beyond teaching physical education. The number and demands of different roles that teachers played influenced how they spent their time in the workplace. The more roles teachers had, the less time they had to devote to planning and instruction for their physical education classes -- which was the primary role they were trained for and hired to fulfill. In addition to the number of roles, some teachers had roles that they preferred over their teaching (e.g., coaching) and as a result, would devote more time to those roles that they enjoyed.

Many teachers were hired or their jobs had evolved based on their willingness to coach or with the expectation that they would teach both health and physical education. In many cases, these teachers were not prepared to teach health, or were hired long before this became a

requirement, and therefore they had to devote a considerable amount of time to educating themselves for the job.

Teachers were also assigned non-teaching duties that required their time and effort in other areas. In addition to official responsibilities (e.g., faculty meetings, monitoring study halls and bathrooms), many teachers often found themselves busy with such unoffical duties as counseling students, assisting colleagues, and attending student functions.

> Emmie [Jacksonville] you know physical education is not coming in and teaching - making somebody a stronger/faster person. Physical education at Jacksonville High School is - and I'm not exaggerating when I say it's probably 50% counseling - a social type of thing here. I handle at least one situation a day.

Teachers believed the requirements of their jobs pulled them in many directions. As a result, they felt less able to devote quality time to their teaching. This prevented even the most well intentioned teachers from concentrating on physical education instruction and encouraged many to resort to survival skills.

Size of School Affected the Number of Roles

In this study, the smaller the school, the more diversified the physical educator's role became. Although teachers in all three schools experienced multiple role demands, the extent to which teachers' time and energy was drawn away from instruction toward other responsibilities varied considerably.

Non-teaching responsibilities in a large school. Teachers at Lukie were the least diversified in terms of variety in responsibilities. This is not to say, however, that these teachers had few responsibilities. With the exception of Mick who had just started teaching health part-time, all other Lukie teachers taught only physical education. Two teachers were presently coaching while eight had coached at some time in their career at Lukie.

Lukie physical educators were responsible for supervising the locker room during classes while students were changing. As part of this requirement they had to sit by the doors after class to ensure student cooperation and to prevent students from leaving early. Although this shortened teachers' time between classes to organize their plans, it provided them with a more informal setting in which to interact with their students. Rose actually enjoyed this time spent with her students.

> Rose [Lukie] This [picture] is taken inside the locker room five minutes left until the end of the class, and these students are standing in an area. We call it door duty where one of us at any given period is scheduled to stand at the door and keep the students there until the bell rings. What in effect happens in this area is actually a chance for the students to come up on an informal basis and discuss just about anything.

Just as organizational responsibilities came from both the school and the physical education department, so did cultural responsibilities. The Lukie physical educators paid little attention to the school's cultural expectations, but were held accountable by each other and by Jonathan for the department's cultural expectations.

Non-teaching responsibilities in a medium-size school. Although teachers at Springdale had many of the same non-teaching responsibilities as those discussed for Lukie teachers (e.g., study halls, hall duty, locker room supervision), Springdale teachers were also required to teach both health and physical education. In addition to their teaching, three of the physical educators at

Springdale were presently coaching and all were assigned administrative duties.

Because there was no physical education department chair at Springdale, the teachers had the additional responsibilities of planning budgets and completing paperwork that would normally be handled by a department chairperson or district coordinator. The physical educators (usually Mary and Carrie) took on these additional responsibilities even though they resented having to do so because in other departments someone was paid and given released time to do similar work. The reality was, however, that if they did not do it -- it would not get done.

Teaching health has become a very common responsibility for physical education teachers in secondary schools. All four physical educators at Springdale were required to teach health classes as part of their job description. This had not always been so but when state mandates required high school health classes, the physical education teachers were expected to teach them. Although this had cut into the physical education program and required teachers to teach less in the gymnasium and more in the classroom, for some this has been an enjoyable addition. Carrie and Mary felt that after teaching

physical education for so many years, teaching health provided them with a welcome challenge. Although Greg enjoyed his health classes, he was less enthusiastic about this added responsibility than either of the women. Warren, on the other hand, did not like teaching health classes at all.

Non-teaching responsibilities in a small school. The physical educators at Jacksonville wore the most hats. Because of their multiple roles they often experienced role conflict. Emmie and Keegan taught both health and physical education and coached. In addition, Emmie was also the athletic director with no extra time allotted to carry out her duties. It was very common for Emmie and Keegan to find their ability to do one job being jeopardized by their need to do another. The most obvious example of this was the teacher/coach role conflict experienced by both teachers.

I observed this in three different ways. One common occurrence was Emmie and Keegan combining their classes with one taking all the students for the period while the other tended to the groundskeeping duties. A second iteration was the teachers combining classes and getting students involved in an activity in the space between the

girls' softball field and the boys' baseball field. Emmie and Keegan then worked on their fields while watching the activity in progress. The third scenario occurred when students were taken out to the fields, given shovels and rakes, and asked to help with the chore of preparing the fields for games. In all three cases, both Emmie and Keegan felt uncomfortable with their situation but felt pressured to do all jobs well. Keegan expressed his frustration with having dual responsibilities competing for his time.

> Keegan [Jacksonville] . . . like us having to deal with the fields, it really bothers me that I have to take away time from my kids to prepare my fields. By the same token, I feel a conflict because I feel like if I don't do this then my team is going to suffer because of what they have to play on. In that respect, just as far as the time allotted from one to the other, I don't feel like I have the time sometimes to do either one of them.

The conflict Keegan felt between his teaching and coaching not only took him away from his classes physically, but mentally as well. On some days when there

was a big game, Keegan said that his mind might not be totally on what he should be doing in the classroom. That might have been a day where he would scrap the lesson plan, instead allowing a day of free play. This would allow Keegan to be there physically to supervise his classes but also allow his mind to be somewhere else.

Emmie learned that in order to survive at Jacksonville, she had to be very flexible. She jokingly considered herself to be a "Jack [sic] of all trades". Although she was responsible for teaching both health and physical education, coaching and administering the athletic program, Emmie did not like all of her responsibilities equally. She said her first love was teaching, her second love was coaching, and her third (which didn't come close) was the athletic director's position. Ironically, Emmie estimated that she ended up spending 90% of her time with her athletic director's responsibilities.

Emmie's responsibilities did not stop with her contractual agreement. She also was the Varsity Club advisor, took responsibility for keeping the juice and soda machine filled for the local teachers' association scholarship fund, and, because of her technical knowledge about the speaker system, was the key consultant for assistance in setting up the gym or auditorium for assemblies and other functions.

Physical education classes at Jacksonville were recreational in nature. This was, at least in part a result of the many affiliated responsibilities that Emmie and Keegan were called upon to do throughout the workday. Whether required as part of their teaching jobs or voluntary, these responsibilities used time and energy that might otherwise have been devoted to quality instruction in physical education classes.

Summary

The teachers in this study were expected to carry out a wide variety of responsibilities -- only one of which was instruction in their physical education classes. Although teachers in smaller schools seemed to have more diverse responsibilities, all teachers in this study experienced various degrees of role ambiguity, role conflict, and role strain. Two extremes were seen by comparing teachers' responsibilities at Lukie with those at Jacksonville.

The example of Emmie and Keegan being responsible for so many different things at Jacksonville clearly illustrated how the heavy load of non-teaching duties along with so many expectations draws teachers' energies away from teaching. With only so much energy and so many hours in a day, teachers cannot be expected to give a hundred percent in everything they are required to do.

Although the question of teacher/coach role conflict appears frequently in the literature, only Emmie and Keegan (Jacksonville) admitted that they experienced some role conflict between their coaching and their teaching. Although this was frustrating for them, they both accepted it as part of their job. Keegan, however, was more frustrated with the situation but realized that under the circumstances he could not expect to give as much to his physical education classes.

Emmie and Keegan were the two teachers who coached the most. For those teachers who spent less time or no time coaching, they experienced correspondingly less conflict. There was no other non-teaching duty that created as much role conflict as coaching.

Conclusion

Although these themes represent a list of workplace factors that teachers in all three schools identified as being important, the meanings given to these themes were sometimes similar and sometimes not. This suggests that these three schools represented three very different workplaces that have some unique aspects, but that also share some broad similarities. This notion of differences among workplace factors from one school to another has been

shown systematically in this study by relating themes identified by teachers to the physical, organizational, and cultural domains. Although it has become clear that each school presents a unique workplace, the themes suggests that physical educators as a whole, regardless of where they teach, may share some similar workplace experiences.

Taken one at a time, the themes present a list of specific workplace factors that teachers, who represent insiders to the world of work in schools, perceived as being important. These 16 teachers from 3 schools generated a list of workplace factors remarkably like those found by earlier researchers (Dombart, 1987; Griffin, 1985; Kershaw, 1987; Veal et al., 1989). Although these lists differ in specific content, they demonstrate that these teachers were able to identify particular aspects of their workplace that enhanced their ability to do their work well and particular aspects of their workplace that hindered their ability to do their work well (Templin, 1989). This indicates that teachers are knowledgeable about their work environment and about its effects on their work.

School profiles were based on all available data compiled from each school. The profiles describe each school as a workplace consisting of particular physical, organizational, and cultural characteristics. Although

the profiles in general represent the job of teaching physical education in secondary schools, they describe three unique workplaces.

In addition to the differences highlighted by the profiles, broad similarities (regularities) were presented in the form of themes. The following themes were discussed in detail: (a) TEACHERS FEEL AMBIVALENT ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF ISOLATION, (b) TEACHERS LACK CONTROL OVER SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS OF THEIR DAILY WORK LIVES, (c) TEACHERS SEEK REWARDS FOR ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN PHYSICAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTION, (d) TEACHERS FEEL A VACUUM IN DEPARTMENT LEADERSHIP: LIKE A BOAT WITHOUT A RUDDER, (e) TEACHERS ARE INFLUENCED MORE BY STUDENTS THAN BY ANY OTHER ASPECT OF THEIR WORKPLACE, (f) TEACHERS' FINITE TIME AND ENERGY IS DRAWN AWAY FROM INSTRUCTION TOWARD OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a synthesis of the findings from this study and to relate findings from this study to those identified in the current related literature (Chapter 2). Specifically, this chapter will include (a) an overview of the study, (b) discussion of the methodology used, (c) discussion of results, (d) implications for teacher educators (e) limitations, and (e) conclusion.

Overview of Study

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of how secondary school physical educators perceived their schools as workplaces. The specific questions that guided this research were (a) How do secondary school physical education teachers describe their work environment and what do they describe as being significant when asked to talk about their work? (b) How do secondary school physical education teachers perceive the impact, if any, of the school context on their teaching? More specifically, this study investigated how secondary school physical education teachers in three different schools described and made sense of the places in which they worked.

Three broad views of the school as a workplace have been identified in the literature: (a) the physical setting of the school, (b) how the school is organized, and (c) the culture in which teachers do their work. These components are described as separate, but in reality are intertwined domains that make up the workplace for teachers. The physical domain consists of the physical characteristics of the workplace. The organizational domain refers to the explicit order within schools, the systems or structures that are in place to govern the day-to-day activities within individual schools. The cultural domain refers to the usually unwritten norms, rituals, and routines that form the fundamental basis for what teachers consider the "rules" for their personal and professional behavior in schools.

Sixteen teachers working in three different secondary schools (grades 7-12 or 9-12) agreed to participate in this study. These schools varied significantly in size and number of teachers employed within each physical education department. Each teacher was given a fully automatic 35mm camera and a roll of 35mm film along with a shooting script and asked to take pictures of their school which would help an outsider understand what it was like to work in their school. In subsequent audiotaped individual interviews,

the teachers talked about their pictures and explained what each picture showed about their school and their work. The transcripts of this first interview were used to identify topics for direct field observations and to develop questions for a final interview with each teacher that took place toward the end of the study.

I then spent a minimum of three weeks at each work-site observing the teachers in each school. During this period, I job shadowed teachers, literally spending entire days at each teacher's side observing them throughout typical work days and talking with them informally about their work. In addition to job shadowing, I also observed teachers in groups. This also provided frequent opportunities for informal conversations about the workplace. The primary foci of my observations were teachers' interactions with others, how they spent their time, what skills and behaviors their school appeared to demand, and in what ways they appeared to be responding to the unique elements of the school workplace. Field notes were taken during job shadowing and observations, and transcripts were generated from tape recordings of informal interviews. A final interview with each participant was done to elicit more details and to confirm what teachers identified as the most important school workplace factors.

Finally, I used the occasion to pursue questions based on my observations.

Data were analyzed as follows. After the tape was transcribed from the initial interview (in which teachers described their pictures) and profiles of each teacher's perceptions developed, profiles were constructed to describe each school workplace as experienced by the resident teachers.

At the time of the first interview with teachers, I began to group the recorded responses and comments into broad data categories to accommodate the major regularities (later referred to as themes) within the teachers' perceptions of their workplace and to allow searches for relationships among categories and for common elements among schools. Profiles and data categories were used to focus my observations within the individual physical education departments and to develop questions for clarification during the final interview. This process continued throughout the entire study. All data were maintained on computer disks and were continuously updated throughout the study.

School profiles depicted each school describing its particular physical, organizational, and cultural characteristics and introducing the physical education

teachers who worked there. Although the profiles generally represent the work of teaching physical education in secondary schools, they describe three distinctly different work environments. Obvious examples of differences included size of workplace, number of non-teaching responsibilities, extent of administrative support for physical education, number of physical education colleagues, and cultural expectations for teacher behavior.

In addition to the differences highlighted by the profiles, broad similarities (regularities) also existed among the three schools. These were presented in the form of themes. Inferences were made to associate each theme with the appropriate physical, organizational, or cultural domains. While some themes fell clearly within one domain, other themes cut across two or even all three domains. The following seven themes represent the workplace factors that the sixteen secondary school physical educators in this study viewed as being important when asked to talk about their school as a workplace: (a) teachers feel ambivalent about the effects of isolation (b) teachers lack control over significant aspects of their daily work lives, (c) teachers seek rewards for activities other than physical education instruction, (d) teachers feel a vacuum in

department leadership: like a boat without a rudder, (e) teachers are influenced more by students than by any other aspect of their workplace, (f) teachers' finite time and energy are drawn away from instruction toward other responsibilities.

Discussion of Methodology

The particular methodological procedure used in this study proved to be useful in addressing the research questions. The combination of teachers' photographs and engagement in formal and informal interviews provided several opportunities for the participants both to think and to talk about their school as a workplace. In addition to those data sources, observations of the workplace and job shadowing allowed close scrutiny of the daily routine of each teacher in the study. This allowed me to investigate, as closely as possible, the daily work life experienced by another individual and to look for relationships between the teachers and their school workplaces. In addition, multiple data sources allowed me to compare information provided by teachers (under several different circumstances) with my personal observations of their work environment, thus triangulating data related to a variety of workplace factors.

Advantages of Using Photography

The use of photography in this study was valuable in several ways. First, it provided the teachers with a working definition of a school as a workplace (a place where people like you go to work everyday). Next, it provided teachers with both a method and an opportunity to think about their school as a workplace. By virtue of the task teachers were asked to do (take some pictures that would help an outsider like myself get an idea of what it is like to work in your school), they were forced to think consciously about both the concept of a school as a workplace and about the particular idiosyncrasies of their school.

Third, the pictures provided the teachers with a structured format for talking about their school as a workplace and an opportunity for me to ask specific questions about their pictures. The pictures and the explanations also provided me with a thorough introduction to each school prior to my observations. By categorizing the pictures after the teachers' explanations, I was able to get an initial understanding of the physical, organizational, and cultural domains of each school; these helped to direct my observations and to develop questions for interviews. By analyzing the particular photographs taken by each teacher, I was able to understand how these teachers perceived their school as a work environment.

Limitations of Using Photography

Although the use of photography was valuable in this research, it is also important to point out the limitations found during this study. Although teachers were asked to take some time to think carefully about what they would like to photograph prior to actually shooting their pictures, it was evident that some teachers were more spontaneous than others with this process. In addition, some teachers took the job more seriously than others, or were simply more creative, which may have resulted in more thoughtful photographs. Furthermore, some teachers were able to provide rich explanations of each photograph while others were far less articulate. The transcripts were more helpful as data in those cases where teachers were able to talk in detail about their photographs.

Although all teachers were initially given a roll of 36 exposure film, not all teachers finished with 36 usable photographs. Some pictures did not come out due to common glitches in photography (e.g., inadequate flash, movement while pushing the shutter, and fingers in front of the lens). In addition, some teachers could not think of 36 pictures to take of their workplace.

Gender and the Collection of Qualitative Data

One question that plagued me throughout this entire research project was whether or not the men in this study

were as forthcoming as they might have been. In some instances, they may not have been completely honest about some of their perceptions. Throughout, my sense was that the women seemed more willing to speak frankly, at length, and in specific detail.

The physical location of the men's offices made it difficult for me to observe them in the same way I was able to observe the women. Because I am a woman, it was acceptable for me to spend informal time in the women's offices. As a result of my presence in a space where teachers tend to be more casual, I felt I was able to cut through the surface reserve (and the wariness with which teachers regard all outsiders) and earn their trust. None of this was possible with the men.

Conversely, all my visits to the men's offices had to be announced in advance and take place during times when male students were not changing in the locker rooms. This limited my contacts with the men to more public moments (e.g., teaching classes, between classes, in teachers' rooms). There was only one man (out of 9) whom I truly felt spoke frankly with me. To varying degrees, I felt that all the others were more guarded, preferring to keep a safe and comfortable distance.

Some of this may be the result of societal expectations that allow women to be more open about their feelings than

men. It also is possible, however, that it may have been a result of the men's effort to keep me, as both an outsider and a woman, from invading their private male culture. Were they uncomfortable, or even unwilling to share certain information with me because I was not one of them? It would be interesting to study the culture of physical education with a male colleague to see if more or different insights could be obtained.

Discussion of Results

There is a Relationship Between School Context and Teaching Physical Education

This study, like other research, has found that school context has a significant impact on teachers, their work and their behavior in the workplace (Dombart, 1987; Griffin, 1985). Schools have a strong role in defining the job of teaching physical education. Earlier researchers have suggested that the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) may be the most powerful socializing agent in learning how to teach. I would argue that although the apprenticeship of observation provides teachers with an early understanding of teaching, and preservice training programs provide students with philosophical ideals and

technical skills for good teaching, occupational socialization (Lawson, 1989) has the strongest influence on teachers' work. It is the individual school workplace that ultimately determines the rules by which physical educators teach and run their programs.

Once teachers enter the workplace, they begin their "on the job training program", a part of the educational process that is crucial to their understanding of the job and survival in their schools, much as the hospital residency is an important part of learning to become a medical doctor. Unlike hospitals, however, which carefully plan a student's experience (and closely monitor their progress) to ensure that the necessary lessons are learned, schools provide little planning for teachers' first years in the workplace. Nevertheless, this aspect of teacher development, whether it is planned for or not, lays out both the explicit and implicit rules and expectations that must be met in order to cross the boundary that separates insiders from outsiders (Lawson, 1989) in schools. Although becoming an insider makes life in schools manageable for teachers, it does not necessarily ensure that teachers suddenly become effective at doing their jobs.

Of the sixteen teachers in this study, Keegan was the only one still fighting to become an insider. Although in

his second year at Jacksonville, he still struggled internally between teaching classes according to his lights or according to the constraints imposed by his school workplace. It had become obvious to Keegan during his first year that teaching physical education at Jacksonville was not what he had believed it would be. Keegan continued trying to define his work as a physical educator while admitting that it was easier simply to develop a teaching style similar to that of his present colleague and his predecessor.

Schools Differ from Other Organizations

Schools are different from other organizations, yet many times we assume that they should operate the same way. The most common expectation is that schools should be like businesses -- tightly managed from the top down with precise goals and a balanced budget. Teaching and learning take place within the context of schools in ways which are significantly different from the work that occurs in other organizations (Griffin, 1990; Handy & Aitken, 1986). These differences make teachers' work in schools unlike workers' jobs in other organizations. Although researchers have begun to investigate the school workplace, there is a void in the educational literature with regard to studies of the school as a workplace from the perspective of teachers.

Because schools are different from other organizations, we cannot simply draw parallels from the organization literature (primarily based on examination of business), particularly when setting goals or evaluating their effectiveness. This is not to say that we cannot learn from or even cautiously borrow some of the understandings derived from the study of organizational policies and procedures that are common to other kinds of organizations. Teachers in this study, for example, suggested that student learning would improve if schools borrowed from the incentive model used in business by setting clear goals, providing middle managers to help teachers achieve those goals, using evaluation procedures that contribute to those ends, and providing pay incentives to reward those who reach the goals of effective instruction.

These teachers believed strongly that the school workplace did little to define or encourage good teaching in physical education and, as a result, condoned mediocrity in physical education programs. There was little instructional leadership and few explicit rewards or incentives for teachers who increased fitness scores or improved motor skills among their students.

Findings from this study support the work of Dreeben (1970; 1973) and Handy and Aitken (1986) who proposed major

differences between schools and other organizations. In addition to those differences (outlined in Chapter Two), this study identified two additional differences between schools and other organizations: (a) schools bestow no clear rewards on teachers who accomplish tasks for which they ostensibly were hired, and (b) schools impose multiple roles on teachers which often result in conflicting demands. These characteristics define secondary schools as being significantly different from other organizations.

No time for management. In secondary schools, physical education teachers are expected to be both workers and managers. In two of these schools no department chairs were assigned to the physical educators, leaving them all departmental management responsibilities (ordering, budgeting, decision making). This is especially significant because managers were assigned to all other subject areas. This caused physical education teachers to believe that their department was not considered as important as other subject areas, contributing to these teachers internalizing their own marginality within the workplace.

In addition, teachers' schedules did not provide any additional time to carry out these extra managerial

duties. As a result, teachers had to borrow from time allotted for planning and instruction in order to carry out required management tasks.

Multitude of purposes: Unlike most organizations that have a single purpose, schools are continually being forced by society to take on more responsibilities and thus to redefine their purposes. The school has become multidimensional, with teachers sometimes feeling more pressure to solve society's problems than to teach knowledge and skills to students. Consequently, the teacher's role in schools has become ambiguous, leaving them unsure about their own purpose within the school context.

Secondary school physical educators are especially vulnerable to this professional ambiguity. Teachers, like those in this study, are marginalized by a workplace that does little to provide support for their teaching or acceptance of their subject matter as a viable and valued part of the total school curriculum. They receive little direction (and no encouragement) to define their purpose within the school context. This problem is not unrelated to the fact that physical education, as a profession, shows the same confusion about its purpose in general. As a

profession we have been unable to reach agreement about goals and objectives in secondary schools. As a result, teachers teaching within the same department often hold very different beliefs about the purpose of physical education.

Students to serve. In most organizations, employees who serve people usually work under circumstances in which those clients are willing participants in the working relationship. The teachers in this study perceived their students as conscripts, and thus believed that their primary task was to solicit and maintain students' voluntary participation in physical education classes (Doyle, 1979). As a result, soliciting student participation became the ultimate goal of these physical education programs at the expense of all other possibilities (e.g., improvement of overall fitness levels or skill improvement).

Because student participation was so important, teachers developed curriculum and planned classes in ways they believed would encourage students to be active. This meant it often was necessary to create class activities from which "participation" could yield little or no learning. Although teachers' beliefs about curriculum and

instructional methods had to be altered, and their goals for learning abandoned, these teachers concluded that this was necessary for survival in their school workplace. Because there were no organizational policies or cultural values to challenge this situation, student influences became the major consideration for all curricular and instruction decisions.

No clear rewards for accomplishing tasks for which teachers were ostensibly hired. In most organizations workers are rewarded for doing the job they were hired to do. Usually this reward system parallels the priorities of the organization. Aside from providing teachers with the contracted monetary reward, the school workplace did little to provide these teachers with a reward system that informed their decisions about how to direct their time and efforts. As a result, teachers were given the liberty to prioritize and place personal value on virtually every aspect of their work. Teachers often chose to put more effort into those aspects of their work that they perceived gave them the greatest reward. Unfortunately, instruction in physical education, which ostensibly was what these teachers were hired to do, was perceived as yielding little or no reward. Consequently, teaching for these teachers

often received the least amount of their time and energy. Instead, they attempted to reap the more explicit rewards from other aspects of their work such as personal and social interactions with students and colleagues, autonomy and the freedom to do as they pleased, and coaching interscholastic sports.

Multiple roles which often imposed conflicting demands. In business, each individual has a clearly defined place in the organizational hierarchy. This assignment carries with it both clear expectations and clear responsibilities. Although physical education teachers hold a place in the organizational hierarchy of schools, they fill a multitude of roles -- each with a unique set of demands and responsibilities. As a result, physical educators must continually make decisions about how to spend their time.

The challenge secondary physical educators have for choosing how to spend their time becomes magnified because the workplace provides no explicit system for prioritizing their many roles and responsibilities. Teachers are thus left to respond to the powerful implicit messages they receive within the school workplace, messages which tell them what is really valued -- and in the schools of this study this was not physical education.

Having multiple roles is especially true for secondary school physical education teachers because of the content relationship between health and physical education and because of the traditional relationship physical education has with sports and recreation. In this study, school size also influenced the number of roles teachers were expected to play. The smaller the school, the more roles assigned to the physical education teachers.

Teachers who had multiple roles experienced various degrees of role conflict. There was no other non-teaching role that created as much conflict as coaching. Although not all teachers in this study were presently coaching, for those who were, coaching provided them with a great deal of personal reward that they did not receive from their teaching. Although some teachers felt some degree of reward from teaching health classes or from their interpersonal relationships with students and colleagues, coaching seemed to spark the most enthusiastic accounts of personal satisfaction. Perhaps this was, in part, because the goals for coaching were clearly defined (teach skills and win games) and teachers felt accountable to both their school and their athletes for attaining these goals.

There was some evidence among these teachers that time earmarked for instruction was devoted to coaching.

Teachers were easily drawn away from physical education toward coaching and other areas of their work where they found substantial rewards, clear accountability and the opportunity to truly teach. This is understandable, given that such conditions rarely are present in physical education classes. Further, coaching and health instruction are roles that were legitimated by others in the workplace and thus received more prestige and value within the overall school culture.

Schools are Different from Each Other

Although schools are similar in gross characteristics and share certain regularities (Sarason, 1982), and teachers share a common teaching culture at some level (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986), the school profiles and themes reported here confirmed Cooper's (1988) analysis that schools differ significantly in ethos, population, staff, character, climate, structure, circumstance, and history.

Results reported here also lend substance to Dreeben's (1970, 1973) assertion that the context of the individual school makes teaching in one different from teaching in another. The data from this study indicate that teaching physical education, definitely varies from school to

school. Although the construct of teaching infers work that is common and well-known, work in schools varies in relation to the specific context of each -- due to significant differences in the physical, organizational, and cultural characteristics of each school.

The physical education subculture defined the largest differences among schools. Although schools differed somewhat in physical design (size, location of the gymnasium, number of available teaching stations) and in organizational policies and procedures (budgeting, scheduling, teachers' non-teaching responsibilities, and inclusion of a department chair for physical education), it was the cultural variations among these schools that defined their most important differences. These schools represented workplaces in which many subcultures existed simultaneously -- mini-cultures with cultural properties of their own. Teachers were members not only of the overall school culture, but also of several subcultures which had powerful influences on their lives. Bruckerhoff (1991) studied high school history teachers and discovered subcultures existing even within a single history department. The physical education teachers in this study also were simultaneously members of several subcultures.

Examples include subject matter, coaching, male and female subcultures.

Although the concept of culture and its implications for physical education teachers' work in schools was not the specific focus of this study, findings imply that it was the physical education subculture which ultimately had the strongest influence on these teachers and on how they perceived their schools as workplaces. This subculture gave meaning to the job of teaching, creating and enforcing the rules followed for teaching physical education within each school.

Although the data from this study indicate clearly that the participants shared this subculture, the data cannot identify how the particular cultural properties of the physical education subculture differed from the overall school culture or from other subcultures in the school. Through observations and interviews, however, it was clear that the physical educators defined their roles as being distinctly different from those of other teachers in their schools.

As in all research, findings from this study lead to such additional questions as:

1. Do other departments also operate as subcultures across all secondary schools?

2. If so, are these subcultures further divided into additional subcultures?
3. How do the properties of the physical education subcultures within individual high schools compare to the broader physical education subculture?
4. From what does this physical education subculture derive its properties?
5. Are the physical education subcultures in these schools unique or are they similar to one another?

Although the overall school culture influenced many of the decisions that were made about physical education in these schools (e.g., designation of a department chairperson, budgeting, scheduling), findings from this study imply that the physical education subcultures within each school had a stronger influence on decisions made within physical education (e.g., curricular and instructional decisions, grading policies, teacher incentives). Even when school policies were set to guide decisions made in physical education, physical educators sometimes chose to ignore them when they ran contrary to the values of their own subculture.

For example, in spite of the fact that curriculum guides outlining goals to teach skills and improve fitness existed in all three schools, in no school did the

administration, other teachers, or students hold the expectation that students would learn motor skills or improve fitness in physical education classes. As a result, these physical educators appeared (unanimously) to value student participation in physical education classes above the formally specified student outcomes. Consequently, all curricular and instructional decisions were made with this implicit, socially negotiated goal in mind. Teachers chose activities that they believed would be popular among the students, organized classes in a recreational game-playing mode, and constructed grading policies that rewarded attendance, changing into appropriate clothing for participation, and participation itself -- rather than achievement of educational outcomes.

The physical education subculture was subdivided further into additional subcultures. In addition to physical education forming a subculture within the workplace, additional subcultures formed within the physical education subculture, creating another layer of school culture. Examples from this study included a men's subculture, a women's subculture, and a men's coaching subculture. Although each teacher held membership in the larger physical education subculture, their membership in

these additional subcultures also influenced their attitudes and beliefs about teaching, and in many cases caused dysfunctional divisions among physical educators within the same department. Although teachers initially projected a united front, continuing conversations revealed that small groups of teachers working within the same departments viewed their roles and their work differently.

The most powerful influence, and the one that created the largest division among teachers in these departments, was the subculture created by gender. Findings from this study strongly suggest that in addition to sharing a physical education subculture that was different from the overall school culture, the men and the women formed subcultures within each department that were significantly different from each other. Each group generated their own set of norms, values, beliefs and behaviors that defined their work within the department. Many times, one set of norms guided their behavior inside their sex-segregated locker rooms and another set guided their behavior outside in mixed company.

Subcultures formed around gender might be expected, given a similar division in society and our history of separate physical education teacher preparation programs for men and women in the past. These divisions may also be

a natural response to the job requirements of supervising locker rooms and the physical design of separate office space provided for men and women.

Findings suggest that the men's subculture was more sports-oriented while the women's subculture was more teaching-oriented. Evidence for this men's subculture being sport-oriented included the larger number of male coaches who were still coaching (whether it was within their present school system or not), the sport-dominated conversations among the men in their locker rooms, and the particular activities being taught by the men (traditional sports). Hints about the women's subculture being more teaching-oriented came from the larger number of females attending professional conferences, more conversations about students' needs, and the particular activities being taught by the women (more lifetime activities).

Implications for Teacher Educators

Preservice: Preparing Teachers to Work in Secondary Schools

The teachers in this study perceived the school workplace as not supporting the instructional efforts that are traditionally encouraged in preservice training programs. Findings from this study are similar to those of

McLaughlin, (1993), Metz (1993) and Doolittle (1993) who found that teachers respond to this lack of support for instruction by adjusting their own goals and expectations for student outcomes in exchange for students' cooperation in class (see also Powell, Farrar & Cohen, 1985). Feeling unrewarded for their instructional efforts, teachers in this study compromised in two ways: (a) they changed their expectations for desired student outcomes (learning skills or improving fitness) to something they regarded as more realistic (participation), (b) they enhanced their own sense of satisfaction by focusing their energy on other aspects of their job where they perceived their efforts to be better rewarded (coaching, personal relationships).

There is evidence from this study that in spite of all that these teachers were taught in preservice education programs about what good teaching in physical education should be, their experiences in the workplace caused them to disregard those notions by redefining good teaching in relation to site-specific expectations. It is not until a teacher takes a job in a school that such site-specific expectations are revealed (Zeichner & Gore, 1990). If this assertion is true, then what implications does this have for teacher educators?

All students, whether they go on to become teachers or not, have strong ideas about what life in schools is like.

This is due to their apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975). High school students who want to become teachers may be more aware of teachers and of teaching during this apprenticeship of observation than students who wish to pursue other occupations. Students who come to preservice training programs wanting to become secondary school physical education teachers thus may enter with very strong ideas about what teaching physical education in secondary schools is like (Hutchinson, 1991). Unfortunately, their ideas are based on limited and unsystematic exposure to physical education teachers' work. They have little basis for looking critically at what they experience or reflecting about what physical education might be. Too often potential teachers (like the wider public) confuse teaching physical education with participating in sports, playing games, or even coaching, and many who enjoyed high school programs with such emphasis want to maintain the status quo (Templin, Woodford, & Mulling, 1982).

I suggest that by the time potential physical educators enter preservice training programs, they have done more than merely observe their physical education teachers at work; many have actually identified with some aspect of the physical education subculture (e.g., the

coaching subculture, the men's subculture, the sports subculture). Their decision to become a physical education teacher is based somewhat on wanting to continue their affiliation with this subculture into their adult life. I would suggest that it is this need to remain affiliated with a subculture that attracts the majority of students to our profession, rather than an interest and a desire to teach high school students.

Conversely, I also suggest that other high school students may be interested in teaching games and skills to students, but are uncomfortable with what they perceive to be the subcultures of physical education. In this way, they are discouraged from entering our profession.

As teacher educators, we need to become more knowledgeable about culture and subcultures and investigate more thoroughly the beliefs undergraduates have about teaching physical education. We need to facilitate discussions about the purpose of physical education in secondary schools and attempt to forge a sustainable agreement about the purpose of physical education in secondary schools.

Students enter preservice training programs with rich knowledge about one particular secondary school -- the school they attended. Teacher educators can help students

examine and challenge their cultural beliefs and knowledge about their own physical education experiences by discussing the various high school physical education programs experienced by their students. School observations can be designed to look beyond curriculum and instruction towards critically examining schools as places where teachers work and attempting to understand the subcultures of physical education.

If we want school reform to include physical education, then we have to help undergraduates imagine and adopt a different value system with regard to their subject field. Teacher educators need to have a clear vision of what ought to be happening in high school physical education classes that is different from what does happen. They must take responsibility for helping trainees acquire both sophisticated knowledge about school culture and the skills needed to help them make the transition from outsiders to insiders -- without trading away their sense of appropriate personal values and program goals.

Future teachers will have to become more "school smart" with skills for identifying particular cultural characteristics that match their own beliefs about teaching physical education. Whenever possible, potential teachers should be taught to solicit jobs carefully in schools where

expectations for physical education most closely match their own personal beliefs (Yee, 1990). When this cannot happen, potential teachers should at the very least graduate from college with a template for looking at their school which will help them to learn about the specific physical, organizational and cultural idiosyncrasies of their school as a workplace. Such a framework for social learning might make their first year less an occasion for frustrating experiences in trial-and-error learning.

Inservice: Helping Physical Educators Working in Secondary Schools

In spite of an understanding of the school as a workplace and an awareness of the influence that school culture may have on teachers' ability to teach physical education in secondary schools, findings from this study suggest that helping those teachers who are already established in secondary schools will not be easy. Teachers in this study knew, ideally, what good teaching was yet they also believed that (due to a variety of reasons that differed among schools) there was a definite difference between this ideal and the reality of teaching physical education in their school. Most of these teachers had taught in their school for over twenty years and

indicated that they had tried continuously to work within the constraints of their particular situation to improve their physical education programs only to come up against roadblocks (e.g., no money, large classes with mixed ability groups, little administrative support, no expectations for student learning to occur in physical education). The secondary school workplace did not support their efforts.

Although these teachers have learned to live within a workplace that does not support their efforts, they wished things were different. They wanted to be a valued part of their schools and believed that they had knowledge and skills that were important to the lives of students. In spite of this, these teachers believed it would be a waste of time to try to change attitudes and beliefs about physical education because they truly believed this could not be done. It was simply easier to accept the job as it was. These teachers had come to understand that the ostensible purpose of employment for which they were hired never was a genuine expectation of their employer.

This presents a major problem for those of us who want teaching to occur in secondary school physical education programs. Perhaps we need to extend our teacher training responsibilities to follow our graduates through their

first years in the workplace and improve our inservice efforts to help experienced teachers negotiate for a school culture that supports teaching in physical education.

Conclusion

The particular themes identified by the teachers in this study portrayed workplaces that fostered marginality. Physical education teachers not only felt left out -- they were left out. These teachers were physically hidden from view, organizationally excluded from the political hierarchy of their schools, and not respected within the overall school culture. Physical educators embraced this isolation and viewed it as autonomy, even though it may have been "autonomy born of neglect" (Bain, 1984, p. 137).

This study indicated that secondary school physical education teachers want to believe that they are a vital part of the school workplace and that they provide a service for students. Because the workplace provided no incentives for teaching motor skills or improving fitness and did not value physical education, teachers looked for their own rewards. Teachers devoted time and energy to tasks that provided them with satisfaction and feelings of self-worth, leaving less time for their teaching. This practice went virtually unchallenged in the workplace.

The practice of physical educators spending time on their coaching at the expense of their teaching is so pervasive in secondary schools that students enter college and university teacher preparation programs with the expectation that although they are studying to be physical education teachers, what they learn about the task is of little real value. They are headed for careers as coaches -- not teachers. This supports Lawson's (1983) notion of career contingencies, that is, teaching is a career contingency coaching. The nature of the school workplace clearly promotes this belief. Students watch this happening in their schools during their apprenticeship of observation and truly believe that it is acceptable.

Even though the participating teachers did not use a common vocabulary to talk directly about their schools as workplaces (nor did I expect them to), they were adept at talking about their schools in relation to their work and were aware of how specific aspects of their workplace determined their success (or lack of success) as teachers. Most (fourteen of the sixteen) had worked within the same school building for over twenty years and as a result were intimately in tune with their work environments. This made them experts on the subject of their school as a workplace.

The degree of influence that the particular idiosyncrasies of the individual school workplace has on

teachers and their teaching remains unclear. Physical educators certainly are influenced to some degree by experiences as school pupils and by their preservice teacher training programs. Once inside their workplace teachers must "learn the ropes" and are influenced to "do things our way". These lessons are not always taught in explicit terms, but through both covert and overt messages, and a reward system that frequently is vague and unspecified. Teachers learn to do their jobs in response to the particular school in which they are employed.

Because the secondary school physical education departments were culturally isolated from the rest of the school, data revealed the inhabitants had evolved their own culture -- a subculture within the larger context of their schools. Within these subcultures, the teachers defined for themselves which norms, values, beliefs and behaviors had value and consequently set the standards for how things were done within their department.

This study stopped short of describing each school culture, and did not ascertain whether other faculty in subject areas also formed distinct subcultures. Findings do suggest, however, that the norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors shared by the physical educators within each of the three schools investigated were not the same as the

norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors shared by the overall school culture. Taken in the context of a school workplace, physical education teachers are, indeed, a breed apart -- the kind of teachers whose professional lives would remain invisible within different forms of research directed at school culture.

Suggestions for Further Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the school as a workplace from the perspectives of secondary school physical education teachers. It has become apparent that the school workplace is a very complicated environment that strongly influences physical education teachers' decisions about how they teach in their schools. There still is much to learn about the relationship between secondary physical education teachers' work and the context of the high school as a workplace.

Data from this study point to the cultural domain as a powerful influence on teachers' decisions about their teaching. More specifically, findings from this study suggest that in addition to powerful school-wide culture, a physical education subculture exists -- with its own component subcultures. These subcultures influence the attitudes, ideas and behaviors of both veteran and prospective physical education teachers.

Many important questions remain regarding the school as a workplace. Are physical education subcultures similar from school to school? What are the cultural characteristics of the men's/women's physical education subcultures? What other subcultures exist within physical education? How early in the teacher socialization process do potential physical educators become aware of or join these physical education subcultures? Can ideas, values and beliefs within a subculture be changed to enhance a greater possibility that teachers will work comfortably together so students will learn motor skills and improve fitness levels in physical education classes?

Appendix A

INITIAL LETTER DESCRIBING PROJECT

TO: Secondary School Physical Education Teachers
Thinking about Participating in a Research Project

FROM: Kathy Pinkham, University of Massachusetts/Amherst

Home address:

DATE:

****

My name is Kathy Pinkham and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. I am presently working on my doctoral dissertation and am looking for members of fairly large (3 or more teachers) physical education departments to be a part of my research. It is important for me to emphasize that final selection of participants will be based on the willingness of all the members of a single department to participate.

This study will investigate the school as a workplace from the perspective of secondary school physical education teachers. More simply, I want to understand schools as places where people like you go to work everyday -- what I call a workplace.

I am contacting you, and the other physical educators in your department, to see if you would all be interested in participating in this study. If, after reading this letter, you are interested, I would like to talk to you in person about this project. I would also need to talk with the appropriate administrators to be sure that I had their permission to work with you on this project.

The specifics of your role in this study are outlined below:

1. As the first step, I would like you to take some pictures -- pictures that would help an outsider, like myself, to get an idea of what it is like to work in your school. No technical skill is required. I would provide some simple instructions. By following them you should find your part in this study both simple and

enjoyable. It should not take a great deal of your time.

Some planning, however, will make the job easier and the results better. Not all pictures will have to be planned. Work sheets will be provided to help you think ahead of time about what you want to shoot.

2. After the pictures were printed I would want to sit down with you to talk about them and have you explain what each picture shows about your school and your work. This meeting would be audiotaped.

3. Next, I want to come in and observe your department for approximately three weeks. During this observation period, I would "job shadow" each physical education teacher in your department for about two days. This means that I would follow each teacher throughout their workday observing classes and other duties. The remaining time, when I would not be observing single teachers, I would be doing general observations.

   During my observations I will be taking notes of what I see.

4. Finally, I would like to talk with you one more time in the form of a formal interview where we would sit down for about 45 - 60 minutes and I would ask you questions about what I have learned about your school as a workplace. This interview would be audiotaped.

Your participation in this study will help you to think about your school in a very different way. I will share with you copies of your interview transcripts and, at the completion of my work, will send you a copy of the results of this study.

At no time will I be evaluating your teaching, your department or your school. I am interested only in learning about your workplace --<u>not</u> in passing judgment on anything or anyone. I am studying your school as a place where you work and will be interested in seeing such things as how and where you spend your time, with whom you spend your time, how decisions are made in your department, and how you carry out the work of teaching physical education in your school. I may also speak informally with other teachers or administrators who come in contact with you daily.

In addition, any information that you give me about your school will not be shared with anyone else in your school building. You, on the other hand, are free to share information about your individual perceptions as long as you wait until after all pictures are taken and the final interviews are completed.

Please think about whether or not you would like to be a participant in this study. Please call me if you have any specific questions. I will contact you in a week to see what you have decided.

Thank you for your time.

Appendix B

INFORMED CONSENT

THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE: THE PERSPECTIVES OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PHYSICAL EDUCATORS

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: My name is Kathy M. Pinkham. I am a graduate student in the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. For my dissertation I am working on a study that examines the school as a workplace from the perspective of secondary school physical educators and examines how the workplace affects physical education teachers' work.

II. TITLE: Perspectives of Secondary School Physical Educators on the School as a Workplace.

III. PURPOSE: To define the school as a workplace from the perspective of secondary school physical educators and to examine how the workplace affects physical education teachers' work.

IV. PROCEDURE: You will be asked to take a roll of 36 pictures of your school as a place where people go to work everyday. The camera is fully automatic so you need no particular skill. I will give you some general instructions, but you will select the pictures in terms of what you think is important and what will show everyday life for a physical education teacher in your school.

You will then be asked to participate in an interview. This interview will be approximately 45 minutes in length. In this interview you will show me the pictures you took of your school and talk to me about your school as a workplace.

I will then come into your school as a non-participant observer. For approximately three weeks, I will observe you and your colleagues at work. I may ask questions of you and some of your colleagues. I will record my observations in the form of field notes.

You will then be asked to participate in a second interview. This interview will be approximately 45 minutes to an hour in length. In this interview I will ask specific questions about your school based on information I learned during the first interview and during my observations. Both interviews will be audiotaped and later transcribed either by me or someone hired specifically to transcribe tapes.

_____
Initials

V. ANONYMITY: In all written and/or oral presentations in which I may use data gathered in my study, I will not use the names of teachers, the names of other people associated with the school, the name of the school or the school district.

Fictitious names will be substituted in all cases. The only individuals who will be aware of the schools involved in this pilot study will be the faculty members of my dissertation committee. Also, since I am working with entire departments, I will not share any of your information with other members of your department or other people in your school building.

As this is not an evaluative study or an intrusive investigation into your relationship with your students, I would like to use some of your pictures as part of presentations or even publications. This will be negotiated with you during our second interview and a signed release will be obtained from you stating how the pictures can and cannot be used.

VI. USE OF DATA: Information from this study may be used in the following ways:

A) my doctoral dissertation

B) discussions and presentations of the research results to professional groups

C) publications of the research results in professional research journals.

VII. WITHDRAWAL: While consenting at this time to participate in this investigation, you may withdraw from the process at any time. Furthermore, while having consented to participate in this interview and having done so, you may withdraw your consent to have specific excerpts from your interviews used in any printed materials or oral presentations if you notify me within 1 week following your second interview at (xxx-xxx-xxxx) or (xxx-xxx-xxxx).

VIII. USE OF DATA: In signing this consent form you are agreeing to the use of the materials from your interview as indicated in IV, V, and VI. If I want to use the material from this study in any ways not consistent with VI, I will contact you to explain and request your further consent.

_____
Initials

IX. COMPENSATION: No special compensation or free medical treatment will be made available by the University of Massachusetts if physical injury should occur in connection with this study.

X. BENEFITS: At your request I will be happy to supply you with either an audiotaped copy or a written copy of the transcripts of your interviews.

I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THIS INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT AND AGREE TO PARTICIPATE.

Date_____

Signed_____
Participant

Date_____

Signed_____
Investigator

Appendix C

SHOOTING SCRIPT

THE STUDY: Thank you again for agreeing to participate in this study. This study will look at the school as a place where people like you go to work everyday -- what I call a workplace. I want to look at your workplace from the viewpoint of a secondary school physical education teacher. We both know that schools can be very different, and the job of teaching physical education can be very different in two different schools.

YOUR TASK: As the first step, I would like you to take some pictures -- pictures that would help an outsider, like myself, to get an idea of what it is like to work in your school. No technical skill is required. I have provided some simple instructions below. By following them you should find your part in this study both simple and enjoyable. It should not take a great deal of time. After the pictures are printed I want to sit down with you to talk about them and have you explain what each picture shows about your school and your work.

HOW TO SHOOT: It is very important that you take your pictures independently from other teachers in your department as some of them may be asked to do the same task. It is perfectly okay, however, to ask other teachers in your department to be in your pictures. Please, do not go together to take the pictures. Please, do not make plans together about what to shoot. Decide and snap by yourself. Talking with other teachers after you are all done is fine, and will do no harm at all.

HOW MUCH TO SHOOT: You have been given a roll of 36 exposure film. Please use up all of the pictures, even if you decide to take several different shots of some thing, person, or situation that you think is especially important to your work. This will allow for pictures that may not come out for one reason or another. On this occasion you do not have to worry about cost or being artistic. Just use the camera like your eye to see things that make your workplace your workplace.

WHAT TO SHOOT: Take pictures of the things that you feel are important in your school, particularly those things that relate to you and your work as a teacher of physical education. Please do not feel you have to be creative.

What I need are ordinary, everyday snapshots. Please, take pictures of people, places, and objects that make up everyday life in your school with most of the emphasis, always, on your life and your work in your school. Remember, what I need is to have your pictures and your explanation of the pictures that will help me understand your workplace and what is like to be there everyday.

HOW TO TAKE YOUR PICTURES: You may do this any way you want to - but there are several ways you could approach it. One is to make one big trip and take all your pictures. Another is to take several trips, taking a few pictures at a time and letting a day or two pass in between. You may want to consider going at different times of day, sometimes when classes are in session, sometimes between classes, and if you wish, before school in the morning or in the afternoon after students have left. If there are places on the school grounds that you feel are particularly important to your work -- please take pictures.

PLANNING AHEAD: Attached is a work sheet to help you think ahead of time about what you want to shoot. You may not want to start shooting right away, and instead, keep these sheets handy for a few days while you think about your school as a workplace. As you think of things that you would like to take pictures of -- simply write them down. This will save time when you go around to take your pictures. Not all pictures have to be planned. Some will catch your eye just as you walk around. Don't hesitate, just snap them. Some planning, however, will make the job easier and the results better. These sheets can also serve as a record of the pictures you have taken.

Thanks again -- should you have any specific questions you can call me at xxx-xxxx. Have fun!!

Appendix D

TEACHERS' TIME LINE

Name of School_____

Phone_____

Expected Time-Line

_____Initial contact with teachers/information letter

_____Initial visit with Teachers/Deliver Film and Camera

_____Estimated time for pictures to be completed

_____First interview to talk about pictures
Teachers' Consent Forms signed

_____Observation

_____Final Interview

REFERENCES

Allaire, Y., & Firsirotu, M. E. (1984). Theories of organizational culture. Organizational Studies, 5(3), 193-226.

Allison, C. B. (1986, October-November). Teacher education to change the workplace. Paper presented at the American Educational Studies Association Convention, Pittsburgh.

Bain, L. L. (1984). The hidden curriculum in teacher education. In H. A. Hoffman & J. E. Rink (Eds.), Proceedings of the Second National Conference on Preparing the Physical Education Specialist for Children (pp. 132-141). Orlando, Florida.

Bain, L. (1983). Teacher/coach role conflict: Factors influencing role performance. In T. J. Templin & J. K. Olson (Eds.), Teaching in physical education (pp. 94-101) Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Baker, E. L. (1980, July). Managing organizational culture. Management Review, 69(7), 8-11.

Becker, H. (1978). Do photographs tell the truth? Afterimage, 5, 9-13.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Bruckerhoff, C. E. (1991). Between classes: Faculty life at Truman High. New York: Teachers College Press.

Carlson, T. B. (1993). Why students hate, tolerate, or love gym: A study of attitude formation and associated behaviors in physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Cohen, E. G. (1973). Open-space schools: The opportunity to become ambitious. Sociology of Education, 46, 1-8.

Conley, S. C., Bacharach, S. B., & Bauer, S. (1989). The school work environment and teacher career dissatisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(1), 58-81.

Cooper, M. (1988). Whose culture is it, anyway? In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 45-54). New York: Teachers College Press.

Corwin, R. G., & Edelfelt, R. A. (1977). Perspectives on organizations: The school as a social organization (Contract No. 300-75-0100). Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 139 790)

Cox, K. E. (1987). The physical education/athletics problem in secondary schools. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 58 (2), 27.

Cusick, P. A. (1973). Inside high school: The student's world. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dodds, P. (1989). Trainees, field experiences, and socialization into teaching. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp. 81-104). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

Dodds, P., & Locke, L. F. (1984). Is physical education in American schools worth saving? Evidence, alternatives, judgment. In N. Struna (Ed.), National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education 5th Annual Proceedings (pp.76-90). College Park, Maryland: Human Kinetics.

Dombart, P. M. (1987). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of their work environment and the effect of that environment upon performance. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1429A. (University Microfilms No. 87-19292)

Doolittle, S. A. (1993). A practice-oriented guide to the influence of school contexts on the teaching of physical education. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Doolittle, S. A., Dodds, P., & Placek, J. H. (1993). Persistence of beliefs about teaching during formal training of preservice teachers. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12, 355-365.

Doolittle, S. A., & Schwager, S. (1989). Socialization and inservice education. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp. 105-122). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

Doyle, W. (1979). Classroom effects. Theory into Practice, 18, 138-144.

Dreeben, R. (1970). The nature of teaching: Schools and the work of teachers. Atlanta, GA: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Dreeben, R. (1973). The school as a workplace. In M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (pp. 450-473). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Duffy, G., & Roehler, L. (1986). Constraints on teacher change. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(1), 55-58.

Eldridge, J. E. T., & Crombie, A. D. (1974). A sociology of organization. London: Allen and Unwin.

English, F. W. (1988). The utility of the camera in qualitative inquiry. Educational Researcher, 17(4),8-15.

Everhart, R. B. (1983). Reading, writing and resistance: Adolescence and labor in a junior high school. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), 2nd Handbook of Research on Teaching (pp. 505-526). London: Collier Macmillan.

Fullan, M. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. The Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 391-421.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gray, H. L. (n.d.). The school as an organization. Cheshire, Great Britain: Bemrose Press.

Griffin, G. (1990, February). Perestroika and professionalism: The case for restructuring teacher preparation. Major symposium #3: AACTE Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Griffin, P. S. (1985). Teaching in an urban, multiracial physical education program: The power of context. Quest, 37, 154-165.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher, 15(5), 5-12.

Hall, R. H. (1977). Organizations: Structure and process. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Handy, C. B. (1976). Understanding organizations. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin.

Handy, C., & Aitken, R. (1986). Understanding schools as organizations. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin.

Hargreaves, A. (1993). Individualism and individuality: Reinterpreting the teacher culture. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (pp. 51-75). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Henderson, B. D. (1979). Henderson on corporate strategy. Cambridge, MA: ABT Books.

Hendry, L. (1975). Survival in a marginal role: The professional identity of the physical education teacher. British Journal of Sociology, 26, 465-476.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1981). Culture and organizations. International Studies of Management and Organizations, 10(4), 15-41.

Hutchinson, G. E. (1991). Prospective teachers' perspectives on the physical education teacher role: Examining the recruitment phase of teacher socialization (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 2712A.

Jelinek, M., Smircich, L., & Hirsch, P. (1983). Introduction: A code of many colors. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28(3), 331-338.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). The primacy and potential of high school departments. In M. W. McLaughlin, J. E. Talbert, & N. Bascia (Eds.), The contests of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities (pp. 167-184). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kershaw, C. A. (1987). The quality of the educational workplace as perceived by the most effective teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 626A. (University Microfilms No. 87-13463)

Lambert, L. T. (1987). Secondary school physical education problems: What can we do about them? Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 58(2), 30-32.

Lawson, H. A. (1983). Towards a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment and teacher education (Part 1). Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 2(3), 3-16.

Lawson, H. A. (1988). Occupational socialization, cultural studies and the physical education curriculum. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 7(4), 265-288.

Lawson, H. A. (1989). From rookie to veteran: Workplace conditions in physical education and induction into the profession. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp. 145-163). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

Lieberman, A. (1988). (Ed.) Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A., & Rosenholtz, S. (1987). The road to school improvement: Barriers and bridges. In J. I. Goodlad (Ed.), The ecology of school renewal: 86th Yearbook of the NSSE (pp.79-98). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On goodness in schools: Themes of empowerment. Peabody Journal of Education, 63(3), 9-28.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 325-340.

Little, J. W. (1993). Professional community in comprehensive high schools: The two worlds of academic and vocational teachers. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (pp. 137-163). New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. W. & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.). (1993). Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts. New York: Teachers College Press.

Locke. L. F., Griffin, P. S., & Templin, T. (1986). Profiles of struggle. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 57(4), 32-63.

Locke, L. F., & Massengale, J. (1978). Role conflict in teacher coaches. Research Quarterly, 49(2), 162-174.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Louis, K. S. & Smith, B. (1990). Teachers' working conditions. In P. Reyes (Ed.), Teachers' and their workplace: Commitment, performance, and productivity (pp. 23-47). Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Martinek, T. J. (1989). The psycho-social dynamics of the pygmalion phenomenon in physical education and sport. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp. 199-218). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

McLaren, P. (1986). Schooling as a ritual performance. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). What matters most in teachers' workplace context? In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (pp. 51-75). New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. W., Talbert, J. E., & Bascia, N. (Eds.). (1990). The context of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities. New York: Teachers College Press.

Metz, M. H. (1993). Teachers' ultimate dependence on their students. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (pp. 104-136). New York: Teachers College Press.

Mitchell, M. F., & Earls, R. F. (1987). A profile of state requirements for physical education K-12. The Physical Educator, 44(3), 337-343.

Morgan, G. (1986). (Ed.) Images of organization. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ouchi, W. G. (1981). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Peshkin, A. (1986). God's choice: The total world of a fundamentalist Christian school. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1979). On studying organizational cultures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 570-581.

Pinkham, K. M. (1990). The school as a workplace. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts, Department of Physical Education/Teacher Education, Amherst.

Pinkham, K. M., Hickey, W., Boscardin, M. L., & Dodds, P. (1989, April). Factors affecting institutionalization of a peer support project for experienced teachers' self directed professional growth. 1989 Program Abstracts, New England Educational Research Organization Annual Conference, Portsmouth, NH.

Placek, J. H. (1983). Conceptions of success in teaching: Busy, happy and good? In T. Templin & J. Olson (Eds.), Teaching in Physical Education (pp. 46-56). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Portman, P. A. (1991). The experience of low-skilled students in public education: The significance of being chosen last. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E. & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and Losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co.

Reyes, P. (1990). (Ed.) Teachers and their work. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rog, J. A., & Pinkham, K. M. (1987, February). Itinerant teachers: A study of job satisfaction among physical education teachers in Maine. Paper presented at the Eastern District Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance Annual Convention, Hartford, CT.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Rossman, G. B., Corbett, H. D., & Firestone, W. (1988). Change and effectiveness in schools: A cultural perspective. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sage G. (1989). Becoming a high school coach: From playing sports to coaching. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 60(1), 81-92.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schempp. P. G. (1989). Apprenticeship-of-observation and the development of physical education teachers. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp. 13-38). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

Schwartz, H., Olson, G., Bennett, A., & Ginsberg, R. (1983). School as a workplace: The realities of stress Vol. 1 (Report NO. 143). Washington, DC: National Institution of Education.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1969). Satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. In F. D. Carver & T. J. Sergiovanni (Eds.), Organizations and human behavior: Focus on schools (pp. 249-260). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Siedentop, D. (1987). High school physical education: Still an endangered species. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 58, 24-25.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28(3), 339-358.

Smith, L. M., & Geoffrey, W. (1968). The complexities of an urban classroom: An analysis toward a general theory of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Smith, L. M., & Keith, P. M. (1971). Anatomy of educational innovation: An organizational analysis of an elementary school. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Smyth, D. M. (1993, April). First year physical education teachers' perceptions of their workplace. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.

Sparks, A. C., Templin, T. J., & Schempp, P. G. (1990). The problematic nature of a career in a marginal subject: Some implications for teacher education programs. Journal of Education for Teaching, 16(1), 3-28.

Sweeny, M. E. (1983). An exploratory functional-structural analysis of American urban traditional and alternative secondary public schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 486A. (University Microfilms No. 84-07808)

Talbert, J. E. (1993). Constructing a schoolwide professional community: The negotiation of a performing arts school. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (pp. 164-183). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Templin, T. (1983). Profiles of excellence: Fourteen outstanding secondary school physical educators. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 54, 15-36.

Templin, T. (1987). Possibilities for secondary physical education. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 58(2), 26.

Templin, T. (1989). Running on ice: A case study of the influence of workplace conditions on a secondary school physical educator. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp.165-196). Indianapolis: Benchmark Press.

Templin, T. J., Woodford, T., & Mulling, C. (1982). On becoming a physical educator: Occupational choice and anticipatory socialization. Quest, 43, 119-133.

Veal, M. L. (1988). Pupil assessment perceptions and practices of secondary teachers. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 7, 327-342.

Veal, M. L., Clift, R., & Holland, P. (1989). School contexts that encourage reflection: Teacher perceptions. Qualitative Studies in Education, 2(4), 315-333.

Veal, M. L., Clift, R., & McCarthy, J. (1990, April). Academic and special subjects: Subcultures and the process of learning to teach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Weinstein, C. (1979). The physical environment of the school: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 49(4), 577-610.

Woodilla, J., Dodds, P., & Boscardin, M. L. (1993, June). Tempus fugit: How elementary teachers use time for work. Paper submitted for presentation at the 5th Annual Ethnographic & Qualitative Research Conference, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Yee, S. M. (1990). Careers in the classroom: When teaching is more than a job. New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner K. M. (1986). Individual and institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives. In J. D. Raths & L. K. Katz (Eds.), Advances in teacher education (Vol. 2). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research in teacher education (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.